

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o CXXII. JANUARY 1906.

ART. I.—THE CHRISTIAN SOCIETY.

IV.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH.

1. *The Christian Ministry.* By the late J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1901.)
2. *The Christian Ecclesia.* By FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT, D.D., Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1897.)
3. *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel.* Von ADOLF HARNACK. 'Texte und Untersuchungen,' II., 1 & 2. (Leipzig : J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1886.)
4. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten.* Von ADOLF HARNACK. (Leipzig : J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902.)
5. *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.* By ADOLF HARNACK, Professor of Church History in the University of Berlin and Member of the Royal Prussian Academy. Translated and edited by JAMES MOFFATT, D.D. Two volumes. (London : Williams and Norgate, 1904.)
6. *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches.* Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford in the year 1880 on the foundation of the Rev. John Bampton

VOL. LXI.—NO. CXXII.

R

- M.A., by EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D., late Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Rector of Purleigh. Fifth edition. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1895.)
7. *Die Gesellschaftsverfassung der christlichen Kirchen im Alterthum.* Acht Vorlesungen von EDWIN HATCH, Dr. Theol., Vice-Principal of St. Mary Hall and Grinfield Lecturer in the Septuagint, Oxford. Autorisirte Uebersetzung, besorgt und mit Excursen versehen von D. ADOLF HARNACK. (Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1883.)
 8. *Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums.* Von Dr. EDGAR LOENING, ord. Professor der Rechte zu Halle. (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1889.)
 9. *Ministry.* By Prof. P. W. SCHMIEDEL, D.D., Zürich. In *Encyclopædia Biblica*. Edited by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, D.Litt., D.D., and J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, M.A., LL.D. Vol. III. (London: A. and C. Black, 1902.)

HOW long the earliest period in the history of the Church lasted it is difficult to say.¹ It may have been only one year or even a few months; it may have been as much as seven years. At any rate the picture which is presented to us shews that there were in it all the potentialities of expansion and growth, which became full of energy and life so soon as occasion demanded. As so often happens, what seemed at the time a small change initiated a series of events of far-reaching importance, and transformed the small community at Jerusalem into the Universal Church.

A dispute arose among the members of the community as to the distribution of alms. The Greek-speaking widows thought that they were neglected. To meet the crisis and to relieve the Apostles seven new officials were appointed whose business it was to assist in charitable administration, and who seem to have been commonly known as 'the Seven.' But this slight incident led much further. All the newly appointed officials have Greek names, and appear to have belonged

¹ Cf. 'The Christian Society, III.: The Earliest Christian Community' (*C. Q.* R. July 1905).

to the class of Greek-speaking Jews, and a new and freer spirit was brought into Christianity. One of the number, Stephen, was remarkable for his eloquence, and his speeches seem to have been different in character from those of the Apostles. He laid himself open to the accusation of speaking against the Temple and the Law, and in his defence before his accusers the 'universal' character of the new faith appears for the first time clearly stated.

Was it not there, it may be asked, before? A traditional Jewish belief, dating back certainly to the time of the 'Second Isaiah,' associated the Messianic kingdom in some form or other with the call of the Gentiles. Christianity was in its essentials a universal religion, and the earliest speeches of St. Peter appear to recognize that if Christianity is for the Jew first, it is also for those who are afar off. But it is one thing to hold the potentiality of a belief, it is quite another thing to realize it. Moreover, it is probable that the Apostles expected the early return of their Master, and that under Him and by His power the universal hopes of the Messianic kingdom would be attained. It would be only gradually that they would realize that it was they, without Him, who must preach the Gospel to the whole world. As soon as circumstances drove them forth, they carried into their work the zeal which was the result of the old Messianic hope. But they, like others, only learnt to understand by the teaching of circumstances the manner in which God's purpose was to be fulfilled.

The change seems to have come rapidly. As soon as the preaching of Stephen had revealed the freer elements of Christianity, the opposition of the Pharisees was aroused, an opposition as vigorous and determined as that of the Sadducees had been temporizing. With the martyrdom of Stephen the first persecution began, and its inevitable result was to spread the Gospel far and wide. The first great service which Saul the persecutor did to Christianity was to break up the community at Jerusalem, and to scatter throughout Palestine and into more distant lands men full of faith and the Holy Ghost, who carried everywhere the new message. 'They therefore that were scattered abroad upon

the tribulation that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phœnicia and Cyprus and Antioch, speaking the word.¹

But the extension soon and inevitably assumed a wider character. At first the preaching was to Jews only, but this restriction was quickly transcended. The barrier which separated Jew and Samaritan was taken down ; then, through the agency of St. Peter, the first uncircumcised Gentiles—men belonging to the class of those who revered the Jews' religion—were admitted into the Church ; his example seems to have been followed by other preachers at Antioch,² and there, in the midst of a Gentile population, a church grew up, entirely separate from the Jewish synagogue, and recognized by Greeks as a new body. When we are told that in Antioch the disciples were first called Christians, it means that in Antioch first the non-Jewish world discovered that there had come into existence a new religious community, which they learned to associate with the name Christ, and called by a name that suggests by its formation a Gentile origin.³ Antioch was the second centre of Christianity.

But Antioch itself was only to be the starting-point of a new departure. The missionary journeys of St. Paul, successful far beyond expectation, introduced a wholly new set of circumstances. Not only did they spread the Gospel into other lands, but they made the Gentile the preponderating

¹ Acts xi. 19.

² Acts xi. 20 : ' But there were some of them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus ' : [Reading "Ἑλληνας with the Revised Version. Westcott and Hort read 'Ἑλληνιστάς].

³ Cf. Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, ii. 15 (E. T.) : ' It is not necessary to suppose that the name was given immediately after the establishment of the Church, but we need not assume that any considerable interval elapsed between the one fact and the other. . . . It was among the pagans that the title arose, among pagans who heard that a man called "Christ" (Chrestus) was the Lord and Master of the new sect. Accordingly they struck out the name of "Christians" as though "Christ" were a proper name, just as they spoke of "Herodians," "Marcians," &c. At first, of course, Christians did not adopt the title. It does not occur in Paul or anywhere in the New Testament as a description applied by Christians to themselves, for in the only two passages where it does occur it is quoted from the lips of an opponent.'

element in the Church. Until then the preaching to the uncircumcised had been timid and tentative and occasional. Afterwards it became the ordinary work of the Christian missionary. What St. Paul did in the largest way was done by many others whose names have been forgotten and whose labours are unrecorded, and before thirty years had elapsed from the Crucifixion Rome was ready to become the real centre of Christian life. It is obvious that this vast extension would necessarily involve a great development both of the outward form and of the conception of the Church, and we must now turn to the different stages in the advance. The institution of 'the seven,' the itinerant ministry, the appointment of presbyters, the central church at Jerusalem, the labours of St. Paul will all demand our attention, and a study of the Pastoral Epistles will give us the opportunity for a final view of the form of Church order at the end of this period.

I.

The first change in the constitution of the community is recorded in the sixth chapter of the Acts. The increase in the number of the disciples had already implied the inclusion of Greek-speaking as well as of Aramaic-speaking disciples, and between the two classes there was, as we have seen, a want of harmony in the important matter of the distribution of alms. Some organization, therefore, was necessary. Moreover, it was felt that the Apostles should be freed from what was a subordinate and less important duty. Consequently seven men were appointed to assist in the daily administration. The names given suggest that they belonged to the sections of Greek-speaking Jews, and one of them is called a proselyte.

There are two main questions in this narrative which demand very careful attention. The first is the relation of these officers to the later diaconate; the second is the form and manner of their appointment.

The word 'deacon' is not used in the narrative. On the other hand, the word 'to minister'¹ is used of the work to which they are appointed. Yet not much stress can be laid

¹ διακονεῖν.

upon this fact, as the word is always in the New Testament quite general in its application. Matthias is said to have been appointed to the 'place of this ministry and apostleship'¹; St. Paul constantly speaks of himself as a 'minister.'² In the present narrative, too, we have the same ambiguity; while we are told that the Hellenistic Jews are neglected in 'the daily ministration,' and that it is unfitting that the Apostles should 'serve tables,' we are also told that the latter will continue in the 'ministry of the word.'³ The term, therefore, has not yet been in any way specialized. Nor elsewhere in the New Testament are those appointed called deacons. Only two of them are mentioned at all, Stephen and Philip, and the latter is spoken of as 'Philip the evangelist being one of the Seven.'⁴ The 'Seven' are compared with the 'Twelve.' Their appointment was looked upon as a unique event. It had been the beginning of great changes in the Church. Two of the number had justified their position in a marvellous way. Being appointed for the 'ministry of tables,' they had been conspicuous in the 'ministry of the word.' But nothing suggests that the Church or the Apostles at the time had any idea in their minds that they were doing more than dealing with an emergency. For the first time they were solemnly appointing members of the new community to hold office. Their action had quite unexpected consequences, and it was therefore looked back to as marking an epoch. It created a precedent, which was afterwards followed; but to say that the Apostles were instituting a new order in the ministry would be to push back into the beginnings of the Christian Church ideas foreign to it.⁵

¹ Acts i. 25, cf. i. 17.

² Eph. iii. 7, &c.

³ Acts vi. 1: ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ καθημερινῇ. . . . 2. διακονεῖν τραπέζαις. 4. τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου.

⁴ Acts xxi. 8: Φιλίππον τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά.

⁵ Cf. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 52: 'But the appointment was not only a notable recognition of the Hellenistic element in the Ecclesia at Jerusalem, a prelude of greater events to come, but also a sign that the Ecclesia was to be an Ecclesia indeed, not a mere horde of men ruled absolutely by the Apostles, but a true body politic, in which different functions were assigned to different members, and a share of responsibility rested upon the members at large, each and all; while every work for

It has been the fashion recently to suggest that we have here the first institution of presbyters. It is pointed out that a few chapters later in the Acts we find presbyters mentioned in the Church of Jerusalem, and that nothing is said of their origin. Here, it is suggested, we have the beginning of the institution. It is pointed out that the number of 'elders' in a Jewish community was seven, and the coincidence is thought remarkable. But this analogy, at any rate, does not support the contention. Not only, as we have shewn in a previous article,¹ is it exceedingly doubtful whether there is any authority for the number seven in this connexion at all, but in any case it did not apply to Jerusalem. Seven was the minimum number for the smallest community, and would have no bearing upon the church at Jerusalem, nor would it afford an analogy which might influence that church. Moreover, the functions of the 'Seven' are not the same as those of the presbyters. The presbyters are clearly associated with the Apostles in the general government of the community and take the Apostles' place when they are absent, if indeed the latter are not included in their number. Their origin we shall discuss later; but it is convenient to get rid from the first of one of the many perplexing theories which confuse our investigations.²

Yet if there was no idea in the minds of the Apostles of founding a new order, it is probable that the institution of the 'seven' forms the model on which the diaconate grew up. We know that in Apostolic times 'deacons' existed in the churches,³ although they are not mentioned very frequently, and that ultimately their presence became universal and essential. the Ecclesia, high and low, was of the nature of a 'ministration,' a true rendering of a servant's service.'

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1904, pp. 54 sqq.

² This view was adopted by Dr. McGiffert, among others, in his *Notes on Eusebius* (II. i. note), but is given up in his *History of the Apostolic Age* (p. 79). The reason for which he gives it up is even less adequate than the reason for which he adopted it.

³ The word occurs in this sense only in Phil. i. 1, *ὁν ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους*; 1 Tim. iii. 8-13; the feminine *ἡ διάκονος* occurs Rom. xvi. 1; but the manner in which deacons are mentioned implies a well-known office. A casual allusion may imply very much more than a formal mention.

The church at Jerusalem would naturally form the pattern upon which the other churches would be organized. Elsewhere there would be the same distribution of alms, and a common fund to be administered. It would be as necessary elsewhere as in Jerusalem to have officers appointed for the purpose, and so the example of the mother church would be followed. The name, too, would quickly and naturally be specialized, just as we shall find that the name 'bishop,' originally used in quite a general sense of the ministry, was specialized to one order. The idea of an order of deacons would grow up because there were deacons in each community, and they would speedily take their place as regular and necessary officers of the Church.¹

Not only the office but the form of the appointment is noteworthy. The Apostles take the initiative. The 'seven' are selected by the community; they are men who have a good repute and are 'full of the Spirit and of wisdom.' They are presented by the community to the Apostles and are appointed to their office by prayer and the laying on of hands.² Now it is very remarkable that here we have all the elements which developed into the normal ecclesiastical ordinations: the call of the Holy Ghost, the selection by the community, the public testimony, and the presentation on the one side; the laying on of hands, the prayers, the full and complete establishment by the rulers of the Church on the other. We shall find as we proceed that both elements are present in the developed form of ordination which existed in the second and third centuries, and it is very remarkable that we should have anything so complete as this in the earliest

¹ On the 'Deacons' see Lightfoot, *Christian Ministry*, pp. 10-17, who discusses and dismisses the idea that there was any connexion with the Chazan of the Synagogue; Gwatkin in *B.D.*, i. 574, 575; Armitage Robinson in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. 1038-1040; Schmiedel, *ibid.* iii. 3132, 3133, who gets rid of all references in New Testament times.

² The following are the different stages:

- i. ἐπισκέψασθε ἄνδρας ἐξ ὑμῶν . . . καὶ ἐξελέξαντο.
- ii. ἄνδρας μαρτυρουμένους . . . πλήρεις πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας . . . ἄνδρα πλήρη πίστεως καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου.
- iii. οὓς ἕστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων.
- iv. οὓς καταστήσωμεν ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης . . . καὶ προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας.

period. It may be suggested that here again the first and definite appointment would naturally form a model, on which subsequent actions would be based. It is a marked characteristic of the author of the Acts that he does not generally repeat what he has once recorded. He lays stress upon Baptism at the beginning of his narrative, but only mentions it afterwards in special cases; he gives the first stages in the gradual expansion of Christianity; he gives typical examples of St. Paul's speeches. We may reasonably conclude, therefore, that the author gives this as a typical instance of the method of appointment generally adopted, and that the model here set became the regular custom of the Church.

It may be well to draw attention to one further point which this incident serves to bring out clearly. From the very beginning almsgiving and charity, as a note of the Church, conditioned its development. Both this incident and the story of Ananias and Sapphira illustrate the extent to which the Church was a society of people bound together to help one another. It was in one aspect what we should call a 'friendly society,' the members of which might count on pecuniary assistance, help in sickness, the due performance of funeral rites, the care of the tomb, and provision for widows and orphans. All this was the direct practical outcome of religious life and feeling, and a large element in building up the community.

II.

The appointment of the seven was not the only change in organization which arose from these incidents. The Church became now (what it was always to be) a missionary society, and very rapidly developed a complete ministry, adapted for missionary work. No doubt at first, as always, preaching and teaching in new places and influencing new converts might be the work of believers who held no definite office, but very quickly those who had special gifts would be differentiated from the general body of disciples, and recognized by the Church. A definite ministerial order thus grew up.

It is curious to notice how little stress was laid on the missionary officers of the Church until the eyes of historians

were opened by the discovery of the *Didache*.¹ Theological controversy had concentrated attention upon the origin of those orders in the ministry which had survived. But the importance of the *Didache* lies not so much in new facts, as in opening our eyes to see the relation of what was in documents which we already possessed. In itself it represents a later period in development than the Apostolic age. It comes very probably from a community which was outside the main stream of Church life. It presents to us the ministry of apostles and prophets in a state of decadence. But for the first time it puts before us clearly the existence of two classes of Christian ministers—those whose prime functions were preaching and teaching, whose work was not confined to any one locality, and those on the other hand who were ministers of a local community, whose first duty was that of administration and government. The latter by the force of circumstances ultimately acquired the sole right to exercise spiritual functions which in the beginning they had possessed only to a slight extent, and became inheritors of the position originally occupied by the missionary ministry. With the key thus provided we turn to the New Testament, and find the interpretation of it immensely facilitated. We see there the distinction clearly existing between the missionary and local ministers; we notice that, as was natural, the former was more important at this stage of development; we understand why so little is often said about presbyters and deacons, whose functions were not as yet very wide; we see, above all, what the force was which gave homogeneity

¹ It is interesting to notice that Bishop Lightfoot, before the discovery of the *Didache*, realized quite clearly the importance of the preaching ministry. Referring to the two lists of the ministry he says: 'Neither list can have been intended to be exhaustive. In both alike the work of converting unbelievers and founding congregations holds the foremost place, while the permanent government and instruction of the several Churches is kept in the background. This prominence was necessary in the earliest age of the Gospel. The apostles, prophets, evangelists, all range under the former head.' . . . 'From the subordinate place, which it thus occupies in the notices of St Paul, the permanent ministry gradually emerged, as the Church assumed a more settled form, and the higher but temporary offices, such as the apostolate, fell away.' (Lightfoot, *The Christian Ministry*, pp. 7, 8.)

and unity to the Christian Church. Not only the Apostles (in the narrower sense of the word) but a vast number of other accredited preachers and teachers must have been continually passing backwards and forwards among the churches, and prevented the isolation and stagnation of the different communities.

The missionaries of the Christian Church were described as apostles, prophets, evangelists and teachers. Each of these names will demand some investigation.¹

We have already discussed the origin and early history of the Apostles.² The word is used most commonly of the Twelve, but it was not confined to them. The Twelve were those who had been sent out by their Master; as such, they were the first preachers of the Christian Church; to a certain extent after the persecution of Saul, to a greater extent after that of Herod, they developed their full missionary activity. They were those who had seen the Lord, who were witnesses of the Resurrection, who were able to record for the benefit of the Church their remembrance of the Lord's words. Through them particularly came the gift of the Holy Spirit.³ But

¹ By far the best discussions on the results of the discovery of the *Didache* are those of Harnack in his edition of the *Didache* (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. II. i. (pp. 93-137) and, with some modifications, in his *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, Drittes Buch, pp. 230-267 'Die Missionare' [English translation vol. i. pp. 398-461, 'The Christian Missionaries']. His occasional extravagances and exaggerations can easily be corrected.

² See *Church Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1905, p. 270ff. The best dissertation on the word 'Apostle' written before the discovery of the *Didache* was that by Bishop Lightfoot in his commentary on *Galatians*, pp. 89-97. Harnack's views may be found in his edition of the *Didache*, pp. 111-118, and in the *Expansion of Christianity*, *loc. cit.* See also Dr. Armitage Robinson in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. 264-266.

³ It has been suggested by Harnack that the original use of the word 'Apostle' was a wide one, and that it was only later that the expression the Apostles' became used as meaning 'the Twelve,' the usage arising from St. Paul's desire to make himself an Apostle in the sense of 'the Twelve.' He writes (*Expansion*, p. 403): 'That the twelve henceforth rank in history as the twelve Apostles, and in fact as the Apostles, was a result brought about by Paul; and, paradoxically enough, this was brought about by him in his efforts to fix the value of his own apostleship.' (This opinion is copied by Harnack's admirers; cf. McGiffert, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, pp. 45-47, 647). On this we may notice (1) that

although their position was unique, and they were given in a special and peculiar sense the title of 'the Apostles,' there were others also who received that name. After Paul and Barnabas had been sent out by the Church at Antioch they are called by the writer of the Acts 'the Apostles.' St. Paul himself, not only continually claims for himself the title of Apostle, which he does in a very special sense, but he also uses it widely of others. He seems to call James, the Lord's brother, who was certainly not one of the twelve, an Apostle. He speaks generally of 'Apostles of the churches.' He speaks of Andronicus and Junias as 'of note among the Apostles.' He calls Epaphroditus the 'Apostle' of the Philippians. In the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, writing with Silvanus and Timothy, he includes them in the designation 'Apostles.' But a stronger argument for this wider use is the existence of false apostles. If the name had been confined to the twelve, it would have been quite useless for any others to go about pretending to be apostles; but if there were many such authorized ministers of the Church we can understand how at Corinth, at Ephesus, and no doubt elsewhere, there were false apostles.¹ These conclusions, which are based upon the

there is no evidence for the idea except a disbelief in the Acts. That book quite clearly represents the twelve as called *par excellence* 'the Apostles,' and shews exactly why St. Paul claimed in a particular way to be an Apostle. (2) There is really no difficulty in supposing that the word was used all through the Apostolic age in both a wider and narrower sense. As a matter of fact all the language relating to the Christian ministry fluctuates between a definite and a general meaning : *διάκονος, ἐπίσκοπος, ἀπόστολος, πρεσβύτερος*.

¹ The following are the principal passages relating to the name 'Apostle,' besides those in the Gospels and the early chapters of the Acts which have been already considered :

(1) Used of the Twelve : Acts viii. 1, 14, 18 ; ix. 27 ; xi. 1 ; xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23 ; xvi. 4 ; 1 Cor. ix. 2, cf. Gal. ii. 8 ; Rev. xxi. 14.

(2) Of SS. Paul and Barnabas : Acts xiv. 4, 14.

(3) By St. Paul of himself : Rom. i. 1 ; xi. 13 ; 1 Cor. i. 1 ; ix. 1-2 ; xv. 9 ; 2 Cor. i. 1 ; xii. 12 ; Gal. i. 1, 17 ; Eph. i. 1 ; Col. i. 1 ; 1 Tim. i. 1 ; ii. 7 ; 2 Tim. i. 1, 11 ; Tit. i. 1.

(4) In a wide sense.

Apostles of the Churches : 2 Cor. viii. 23, *ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν, ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν* ; Epaphroditus, Phil. ii. 25, *Ἐπαφρόδιτον . . . ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον, καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου* ; Andronicus and Junias, Rom. xvi. 7, *οἰτινὲς*

New Testament, are corroborated by the language of the *Didache*, which still speaks of apostles as existing in the Church and gives directions for distinguishing the false from the true apostle, and in the *Shepherd* of Hermas.¹

What, then, constituted an Apostle? He was probably a Christian missionary solemnly sent forth by the Church, as Barnabas and Paul had been, to preach the Gospel and to found churches. In that position he held a special relationship to the churches which he had founded—a relationship which was emphasized by St. Paul when he wrote to the Corinthians, 'Are not ye my work in the Lord? If to others I am not an Apostle, yet at least I am to you: for the seal of my Apostleship are ye in the Lord.'²

For the origin of the order of Prophets we must go to the earliest periods in the history of the Church. In his speech on the day of Pentecost, St. Peter is represented as quoting the well-known words of Joel:

'I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh:
And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,
And your young men shall see visions,
And your old men shall dream dreams,'

as describing the new outburst of spiritual life in the Church. No doubt, from the very beginning this implied a revival of the gift of prophecy. At first it might be entirely unregulated, as it appears to have been later at Corinth, and will always, indeed, have a tendency to be in times of a sudden increase of spiritual life, but very quickly it would be found that there
εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις; Silvanus [and Timothy?], 1 Thess. ii. 7; James, the Lord's brother, [?] Gal. i. 19.

(5) False Prophets: 2 Cor. xi. 13, *οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ψευδαπόστολοι . . . μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ*; Rev. ii. 2, *τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους*.

(6) Used generally of an order in the Church: 1 Cor. xii. 28; 1 Cor. iv. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 7; Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11; Rev. xviii. 20; 2 Peter iii. 2; Jude 17.

(7) The signs of an 'Apostle': 1 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 1.

¹ For the wider use of 'Apostle' in later literature see *Didache* xi.; Hermas, *Vis.* iii., 5. 1; *Sim.* ix., 15. 4, 16. 5, xxv. 2; Iren. ii. 21, 1; Tert. *adv. Marc.* iv. 24; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. pp. 445, 447; Euseb. *H.E.* i. 12.

² 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2.

were some especially who had received the gift, and to these the name of 'prophet' would be given. The prophet, like the apostle, would be held in great honour in the Church, and although we have no certain information concerning the method of appointment, or as to what enabled a man to be looked upon as technically a prophet, it is clear that the word implies a definite office.¹

Probably the earliest reference to the existence of the office is the name Barnabas² conferred by the Apostles and implying the possession of the prophetic gift. Before the persecution under Herod, prophets are represented as coming down from Jerusalem to Antioch, and foretelling a famine.³ Somewhat later we have a body of prophets and teachers at Antioch—Barnabas, Symeon called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen and Saul. These were ministering to the Lord, and fasting; and acting under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit they send forth Saul and Barnabas with prayer and the laying on of hands.⁴ After the Council at Jerusalem Judas and Silas, who had been sent to bear the decrees of the Council to Antioch and are described as men of authority and as prophets, exhort the brethren.⁵ St. Paul not only speaks of prophecy as among the greatest of spiritual gifts, but describes the prophet as placed by God

¹ This question will have to be discussed generally later; meanwhile it will be sufficient to quote Harnack's words, which do not certainly go beyond the evidence: 'The early source incorporated in Acts xiii. gives an excellent idea of the way in which this divine appointment is to be understood in the case of the apostles. . . . We may assume that in other cases also the apostles could fall back on such an exceptional commission. The prophets were authenticated by what they delivered in the form of messages from the holy Spirit, in so far as these addresses proved spiritually effective. . . . The teacher also ranked as one who had received the holy Spirit for his calling: whether he was a genuine teacher or not, was a matter which, like the genuineness of the prophets, had to be decided by the churches. Yet they merely verified the existence of a divine commission; they did not in the slightest degree confer any office by their action.' (Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 419, 420.) What is correct in the above passage is that the recognition of these 'offices' must have implied formal action on the part of the Church, probably in all cases 'laying on of hands.'

² Acts iv. 36, 37.

³ Acts xi. 27, 28.

⁴ Acts xiii. 1-3.

⁵ Acts xv. 22, 32.

in the Church, and in enumerating the officers of the Church on both occasions mentions prophets immediately after the apostles. They have played a great part in building up the Church.¹

In their functions the prophets resembled the Apostles as being officers of the whole Church, and not confined in their duties to any one locality; they differed from them in that their work was primarily that of edifying the faithful rather than of converting the unbeliever.² Their gifts were those of inspired oratory, an insight into the future, a strong grasp of spiritual truths, earnestness, a power of rousing religious enthusiasm, consolation, exhortation, revelation.³ Probably the book which more than any other is a survival of the age of Christian prophecy is the Apocalypse. The author definitely calls his work 'the prophecy of this book'⁴ and is spoken of as one of the prophets.⁵ Throughout the prophets are prominently mentioned;⁶ and the book itself bears all the characteristics which we would associate with the word 'prophecy.' It has caught and preserved much of the spirit and language of the old Hebrew prophecy. Its deeply impressive imagery, its figurative mode of expression, its strong grasp of spiritual reality, which is the basis of any true insight into the future, its faith in the unseen are employed to console, to strengthen, and to exhort the disciples who are struck down by the terrors of a great persecution. St. Paul himself had the gift of prophecy, and many passages in his Epistles testify to it. This gift of inspired language and spiritual insight was one of the great forces in building up the Church, and the prophets were the bearers of its deepest revelations concerning the true way of life.⁷

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, xiv. 1 *sq.*; Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11.

² Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

³ *Ibid.* 3 *sq.*

⁴ Rev. xxii. 7, 10, 18, 19.

⁵ *Ibid.* 6, 9.

⁶ Rev. xi. 18, xvi. 6, xviii. 20, 24.

⁷ On the Prophets generally see Harnack, *Lehre der Zwölf Apostel* pp. 119-131, *Expansion of Christianity*, *loc. cit.* It is not necessary, at present, to work out the later history of the order; we are only concerned with its origin and early characteristics. It may be added that Harnack ascribes to this body the composition of the so-called Catholic Epistles and writings, books to which at a later date apparently the name of an Apostle was given by mistake. 'An epistle like that of James, addressed "to the

The two other offices will demand slighter investigation. Certainly once, perhaps three times, we have reference to a class of ministers called Evangelists. In the list of the ministry in the Epistle to the Ephesians they are mentioned immediately after the apostles and prophets. Philip, one of the seven, is called 'the evangelist,' while Timothy is exhorted by St. Paul to do the work of an evangelist, an expression which may mean that he, being an evangelist, should fulfil the functions of that office, or that, not being technically one, he should do his duty as a preacher of the Gospel. To 'announce the glad tidings' was an Old Testament expression, used regularly in the New Testament times of the Christian preacher and capable of being employed with reference to any missionary, whether apostle, prophet or even ordinary disciple, who might help in the spread of Christianity; but apparently the word 'evangelist,' like most of the other expressions that we have examined, was also, although not very commonly, used in a more limited sense. Nor can there be much doubt as to its meaning. It would be used of those who were engaged in missionary work, who were not 'prophets,' and were not on the same level with the apostles. It was probably therefore used as a synonym for those who were often called apostles in the broader sense of the term. Philip, called 'the evangelist' in the Acts, was spoken of in later traditions as 'the apostle'; Timothy is included in the general use of the term 'apostle' in one place, and seems to be called an evangelist in another. And this was natural. There was always a tendency to limit the term 'Apostle' to the twelve, later to the twelve with St. Paul, and this would naturally suggest the employment of another name for the ordinary missionary. But the specialized use of the word 'Evangelist' did not live; we have no authority for it in post-

twelve tribes of the dispersion," with its prophetic passages, its injunctions uttered later to presbyters, and its emphatic assertions, this epistle, which cannot have come from the apostle James himself, becomes intelligible so soon as we think of the wandering prophets who were conscious of a divine calling which led them to all Christendom, and who consequently felt bound to serve the Church as a whole.' We doubt whether the possession of prophetic gifts is an excuse for literary forgery.

Apostolic literature, and in Eusebius' *History* it is an anti-quarian survival.¹

The term 'Teacher' is also not common, but probably for different reasons. Side by side with the missionary who first announced the glad tidings, and the prophet with his inspired utterance, was the Christian teacher, whose business it would be to impart the knowledge of the Gospel history and those other facts which formed the basis of the Christian belief. When books were, comparatively speaking, few, when the Christian literature was as yet unwritten, almost all instruction must have been oral, and it is an interesting speculation how far the set narratives of the life and words of our Lord, such as that in St. Mark's Gospel, and the materials out of which the other Gospels were composed, were the work of the Christian teacher. Anyone who has seen a body of students in a Mohammedan mosque sitting round a Mollah, who recites to them the traditions which he has received, will readily picture to himself the early Christian teacher, whether in the courts of the Temple or in a private house. The Gentile convert would have to be introduced to the Old Testament as well as the New. The Messianic prophecies needed explanation, and very early there were probably collections made of important passages used for teaching purposes.² Very early, too, a definite moral code, such as we find in the 'Two Ways' of the *Didache* and other documents, and a short compendium of Christian doctrine would be found necessary, and St. Paul is able to speak of 'that form of teaching into which ye were delivered.'³

The 'Teacher' held quite clearly a definite office in the early Church. The company who send out Barnabas and Saul are described as 'prophets and teachers'; in both the lists given by St. Paul they are mentioned, in one case third,

¹ The passages where *εὐαγγελιστής* is used in the New Testament are Acts xxi. 8, Eph. iv. 11, 2 Tim. iv. 5. The word is used in Eusebius in a very interesting passage, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 37; it also occurs in the Apostolic Canons, ch. 19; Tert. *de Praescr.* iv., *de Corona* ix. In no case are these survivals of an older use; they are merely Biblical expressions.

² Cf. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 282; Hatch, *Essays on Biblical Greek*, p. 103.

³ Rom. vi. 17, *εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδασκῆς*.

in the other fifth, coupled with pastors,¹ and the evidence of the New Testament is corroborated by the evidence of the *Didache* and other post-Apostolic writings.² If anyone in the New Testament may be selected as an example of the Christian teacher, it is Apollos. He was 'a learned man,' 'mighty in the Scriptures,' who 'taught carefully the things concerning Jesus,' who 'powerfully confuted the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ.'³ But the teachers are not often mentioned, and this for two reasons. In the first place, the teacher who was only a teacher and nothing more must have been a very unimportant individual. To teach, of course, would be the work of all the Christian missionaries. They seem all to be included in the expression, 'them that speak the word of God.'⁴ To teach was the work of St. Paul as much as of anyone else. Timothy is exhorted to give heed to 'reading, to exhortation, to teaching.'⁵ But there was another reason why the 'teachers' speedily became less important, namely that teaching would naturally become very early the duty of the local officers of the community, whose appointment we shall shortly describe. These could not in the nature of things be missionaries; they would be very unlikely to possess the fervid oratory and the inspired utterance of the prophets; but as soon as they had been taught themselves they might begin to teach others, and so we find in the Pastoral Epistles presbyters mentioned who labour in the word and teaching.⁶ There would be great danger in the itinerant teacher, a man often of no position and doubtful credentials, who might easily be an impostor. From the beginning a correct knowledge of the original message delivered would be the first desire of a new church, and this would be more easily acquired and preserved by attentive adhesion to the words or writings of the Apostolic founder than by the instruction of a more or less irresponsible teacher. The 'order,' therefore,

¹ Acts xiii. 1, 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, Eph. iv. 11; cf. James iii. 1.

² *Didache*, 13, 15. *Hermas*, *Sim.* ix. 25, 2.

³ Acts xviii. 24-28.

⁴ *Didache* iv., Heb. xiii. 7. See Harnack, *Expansion* [E.T.] i. p. 417 sq.

⁵ 1 Tim. iv. 13.

⁶ 1 Tim. v. 17.

although it survived the Apostolic period, was never of importance, and at a later date the teacher was rather an individual of exceptional power than the member of a particular class or order. He was generally, but not always, a presbyter or bishop, and there was probably a certain amount of suspicion always attached to a lay professor.¹

The Christian missionaries were in the first place a body of teachers and preachers. They were those who spake the word of God. They had received for this, in an especial way, the gift of the Holy Spirit. They were also the leaders in all spiritual functions. They are described in the New Testament as 'ministering in holy things,'² as leaders in prayer; they lay their hands on Barnabas and Saul; they are for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ.³ It is quite in accordance with these hints that we find in the *Didache* that it is the privilege of the 'prophets' to offer the solemn Eucharistic thanksgiving as they desire, and that they are designated as the high priests of the Church.⁴ They had also a position of authority. Every Apostle was considered to have authority over the church which he had founded, but further than that, prophets and other 'ministers of the word' were included in the number of the 'chief men' or rulers.⁵ When any of them were present in any community, they would take the lead in preaching and praying, they would preside at the Eucharistic meal, and great authority would be attached to their words and advice in the Church.

¹ On the Teachers see Harnack, *Lehre der Zwölf Apostel*, 131-137, *Expansion of Christianity* [E.T.] i. 444-458. He collects a number of interesting passages, but the deductions that he makes are vitiated by his obvious purpose. When Barnabas, or Ignatius, or Dionysius of Alexandria say they are not 'teachers,' they do not mean that the 'teachers' were very important people, whom they were too humble to imitate, but that they wished to speak to their fellow-Christians as one man to another. There is no evidence that at any period of Church history 'teachers' occupied any great position as such, but at all times there have been individuals who have been prominent for good or evil, and who have been in character, if not actually, 'lay professors.'

² λειτουργούντων αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ, Acts xiii. 2.

³ Eph. iv. 12.

⁴ *Didache*, cc. 10, 13. ⁵ ἡγούμενοι, Acts xv. 23; cf. Heb. xiii. 7, 17.

It has already been suggested how important a part these missionaries played in creating the homogeneity of the Church. Few communities would be long isolated from the general Church life, and new ideas would travel quickly and easily from place to place. The comparative paucity of references to these missionaries is no ground for thinking that they were not numerous or important. It is the characteristic of all natural and spontaneous literature, like that of the New Testament, that it does not dwell on the obvious and commonplace, but only alludes to it. And we have quite enough evidence to make us realize how important and numerous they were. Our Lord had foretold that He would send prophets and wise men and scribes, and that they would be scourged and persecuted and put to death.¹ The Church was built on the foundations of the apostles and prophets; that which had been hidden in the generations past had been revealed in the Spirit to Christ's holy Apostles and prophets.² The writer of the Apocalypse is filled with the thought of the prophets who have given their blood for the Church. In Babylon the blood of the saints has been shed, therefore 'Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye saints, and ye apostles, and ye prophets: for God hath judged your judgement on her.'³ St. Paul, asking whether an adequate Apostolic ministry has been sent forth to bring to the people of Israel the message about Christ, is able to answer in the words of the great evangelical prophet, 'How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things,' and thinking of the great army of apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, and saints who had received the divine commission, he adds, in words chosen from the book of Psalms: 'Their sound has gone out into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.'⁴

¹ Matt. xxiii. 34; cf. x. 41.

² Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5.

³ Rev. xviii. 20.

⁴ Harnack, in his edition of the *Didache*, had stated that the missionaries—the apostles, prophets, and teachers—were an original creation of the Christian Church. 'Analoges im Judentum der damaligen Zeit ist m. W. nicht nachgewiesen, und auch Erkundigungen bei Sachkennern in dieser Richtung sind resultatlos geblieben' (p. 110, note). But in his later work he devotes a long investigation to proving the

III.

The persecution on the death of Stephen not only taught the Church its missionary vocation ; it also began, if it did not entirely complete, the breach between Church and Synagogue. No doubt the persecution was intermittent, as all persecutions are ; no doubt there were at Jerusalem many Christians who kept the Law, who were not exposed to the hatred of their brethren, and to a certain extent conciliated the opposing factions. So long as Jewish Christians continued to hope to impose the Law on Gentile believers, it might seem as if the breach were not irreparable. But any such hopes were really quite delusive, and even when there was no active persecution it would rarely be possible for Jews and Christians to live in harmony. The Christians would henceforth normally be expelled from the synagogues, and it would be necessary for them to form new associations for themselves. This introduces us to the many vexed questions connected with the origin of the Christian presbyters.

The problem is a very complicated one, and we shall approach it most easily if we begin by summing up the evidence of the New Testament. The 'presbyters' are first mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, shortly before the persecution under Herod. Barnabas and Saul are represented as taking contributions from the Church at Antioch to the brethren in Judæa who are suffering from famine, and as giving them to

analogy. It is probable that his earlier judgement was more correct. Of course the word 'prophet' came from Judaism, but the Christian prophets looked back to old days, and neither their position nor name owed anything to contemporary models. No doubt, too, there were Jewish Rabbis and teachers as there were heathen philosophers, but the status of the Christian teacher was quite independent of either analogy. The question of the apostle is more difficult, and depends on our estimation of the value of later evidence. Lightfoot had quoted, and Harnack has repeated, the evidence from Epiphanius and other writers for Jewish apostles in the fourth century, but no early evidence has been found ; there is no passage which can be quoted from Josephus, and the word even in an untechnical sense is not in the LXX. Under these circumstances the balance of evidence must remain in favour of regarding both the name and office of Apostle as an original Christian institution.

the presbyters. The context would suggest that the presbyters belonged to churches not only in Jerusalem but in Judæa generally.¹ Subsequently they are several times mentioned at Jerusalem, generally in the combination 'Apostles and presbyters.'² St. Paul is stated to have established presbyters in all the cities in which he had founded churches during his first missionary journey,³ and at the end of the third, when he wishes to bid farewell to the Church at Ephesus, it is the presbyters of the Church that he summons to Miletus.⁴ The presbyters are not mentioned by name in the early Epistles of St. Paul, but directions are given for their appointment in the Epistle to Titus,⁵ and they are mentioned also in the first Epistle to Timothy.⁶ They are mentioned besides in the first Epistle of St. Peter,⁷ and the Epistle of St. James,⁸ while the second and third Epistles of St. John are written by one who calls himself a presbyter.⁹ If we pass outside the limits of the New Testament canon, we find very early evidence for the widespread prevalence of presbyters, and as soon as we have full historical evidence a college of presbyters is an essential element in the government of every church.

But the evidence for their existence in the Apostolic age as a normal and regular ministry is much stronger. A careful and impartial survey of New Testament language makes it, we think, clear that the presbyters were often called also 'bishops' or 'overseers,' and 'pastors,' and that when either of these are referred to presbyters are meant. The passages are the following. When St. Paul bids farewell to the Church of Ephesus he summons, as we have already mentioned, the presbyters; but in his speech he calls them 'bishops' and speaks of their office as that of being 'pastors of the

¹ Acts xi. 29, 30; τῶν δὲ μαθητῶν καθὼς ἤμπορειό τις, ὥρισαν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς· ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαν, ἀποστελλαντες πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους διὰ χειρὸς Βαρνάβαν καὶ Σαύλον. It may be added that the πρεσβύτερος will always be translated 'elder' of Jews, 'presbyter' of Christians, unless there is any reason in the latter case for bringing out the meaning 'elder.'

² Acts xv. 2, 4, 22, 23; xxi. 18.

³ Acts xiv. 23.

⁴ Acts xx. 17.

⁵ Titus i. 5.

⁶ 1 Tim. iv. 14, 17, 19.

⁷ 1 Peter v. 1.

⁸ James v. 14.

⁹ 2 John 1, 3 John 1.

flock': 'Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to be pastors of the Church of God which He purchased with His own blood.'¹ In a very similar way St. Peter exhorts the presbyters, he himself being their fellow presbyter, to 'be pastors of the flock of God' which is among them, 'exercising the office of bishop, not of constraint, but willingly.'² In the Epistle to Titus St. Paul states that he has left him in Crete to appoint 'presbyters' in every city, and immediately afterwards speaks of the functions of a 'bishop,' apparently referring in both cases to the same office. In the parallel passage in the first Epistle to Timothy he speaks of 'a bishop' and 'deacons,' while elsewhere in the same Epistle he mentions presbyters.³

¹ Acts xx. 17: ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μιλήτου πέμψας εἰς Ἔφεσον μετακλίσατο τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας . . . (28) προσέχετε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνί, ἐν ᾧ ὑμεῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου. In what follows ἐπίσκοπος will be always translated 'bishop' unless there is any particular reason for laying stress on the idea of 'overseer,' and ἐπισκοπεῖν to 'act as bishop' or 'fulfil the office of bishop.' So ποιῶν is rendered 'pastor,' and ποιμαίνειν 'to be a pastor.' The object is to make clear the identity of words, both in the New Testament and in later usage. Distinctions in the character of the office will be pointed out. It is not intended to imply that we have new titles; in both cases the words are descriptive, a point which is brought out clearly by putting the two words ἐπίσκοπος and ποιῶν side by side. No one thinks that ποιῶν was a title, and there is no more reason for thinking ἐπίσκοπος is one. In both cases they are descriptive words, which gradually became 'titles.' Hort's commentary on this passage (*The Christian Ecclesia*, pp. 97 sq.) is interesting and suggestive.

² 1 Pet. v. 1-3: Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ, ὁ σὺνπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων . . . ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποιμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, [ἐπισκοποῦντες] μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκουσίως· μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς, ἀλλὰ προθύμως. μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων, ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου. Ἐπισκοποῦντες is omitted by W.H. with $\aleph B$ and a few cursives; it is read by the Revised Version with all other authorities, including all the Versions and most of the Fathers. The balance of evidence must be in favour of retaining it; it might easily be omitted by any scribe after the age of Irenæus who did not understand the word as applied to presbyters, and the evidence of the Versions which avoid that difficulty by paraphrasing is strong on the other side. Still, any who object to the evidence may neglect it so far as regards the word ἐπίσκοπος. It is not necessary, and the passage still holds good for ποιμαίνειν.

³ Titus i. 5-7: τοῦτου χάριν ἀπέλειπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ ἵνα τὰ λείποντα

Similarly, in the Epistle to the Philippians, he speaks of bishops and deacons, apparently as representing the officers of the community.¹ Nor is this usage confined to the Apostolic age ; it survives in the *Didache*, where only bishops and deacons are mentioned,² and in the Epistle of Clement, where bishops and deacons are mentioned as appointed by the Apostles and shortly afterwards the bishops are referred to as presbyters.³ And this original identity of bishops and presbyters is widely recognized by ecclesiastical authors, as for example, Jerome, Chrysostom and Theodoret, and has left its mark on the Ordinal. In an early writing we are told that the bishop differs from the presbyter only in the ' Chair ' and the right of ordination, and in the Western Church the order of bishops is not historically different from the priesthood.⁴

ἐπιδιορθώσῃ, καὶ καταστήσῃ κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, ὡς ἐγὼ σοι διαταξάμην, εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος . . . δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς Θεοῦ οἰκονόμου. Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 1 sq. ; iv. 17, 19. It may be possible to get round these passages, as has been done by German scholars who desire to find evidence of the lateness of these Epistles and by others in the interest of Episcopalianism, but the above interpretation is the most natural and harmonizes with the other passages quoted. The singular is most adequately explained by Hort, *op. cit.* p. 189 sq. It must be remembered that if the identification of bishop and presbyter in the Pastoral Epistles cannot be held, their evidence is decisive for what is called Monarchical Episcopacy. In all cases, ἐπίσκοπος occurs in the singular, and the Epistles give no support at all to the theories of Hatch and Harnack.

¹ Phil. i. 1 : πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλιπποῖς σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις. See Hort, *op. cit.* p. 211 sq., who, however, presses too far his theory as to the non-technical use of the word. In many of the passages the usage of the word is transitional. It is needless to say that some writers, like Schmiedel, would omit the words σὺν . . . διακόνοις. There is absolutely no authority for so doing but the desire to get rid of a passage which does not harmonize with preconceived theories, but which does harmonize with New Testament usage.

² *Didache*, 15.

³ Clem. Rom. xlii. 4 : κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν . . . εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν . . . (xliv. 4) : ἁμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτους καὶ ὁσίως προσενηγόντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν. (5) μακάριοι οἱ προδοιοπορήσαντες πρεσβύτεροι, οἵτινες ἔγκαρπον καὶ τελείαν ἔσχον τὴν ἀνάλυσιν· οὗ γὰρ εὐλαβοῦνται μὴ τις αὐτοὺς μεταστήσῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱδρυμένου αὐτοῖς τόπου.

⁴ The best discussion of the identity of bishops and presbyters in

This survey of the evidence gives good grounds for believing that in Apostolic times the churches were governed by bodies of presbyters, who were often spoken of, in consequence of the functions of their office, as bishops or overseers, and pastors. The evidence for them exists from a very early period, and it is reasonable to hold that, as the Acts definitely mention in the case of St. Paul, they were generally established by the Apostles. Clement writing at the end of the first century, says that the Apostles, 'preaching everywhere in country and town, appointed their first fruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that believe.'

It remains now to consider various objections which have been raised to this account of the matter. It is well known that a theory first suggested by the late Dr. Hatch, and then warmly taken up and developed by Professor Harnack, denies this identity of the presbyters and bishops. The presbyters were one type of organization; they were the old men as opposed to the young men. Their duties were purely administrative and not spiritual, and they had no share as presbyters in the gifts of the Spirit. The bishops and deacons were a second type. They were the finance officers of the community. Ultimately the two were combined together, and monarchical episcopacy came not by elevation from the presbyterate, but by concentrating in the hands of one man the duties which had been shared by the body of bishops.

the Apostolic age is contained in Lightfoot's dissertation in his edition of the Epistle to the Philippians (pp. 95-99). It is a misfortune that this, with the companion dissertation on the word 'Apostle' already referred to, has not been published with the *Treatise on the Ministry*. Lightfoot's conclusions are supported by Hort (*loc. cit.*), with a somewhat excessive subtlety. The rival explanation of Hatch and Harnack will be noticed shortly. It is examined with great vigour and the older arguments are restated by Dr. Schmiedel (*Encyclopædia Biblica*, iii. 3135 sq.), who maintains the identity of *presbyter* and *episcopus*. The beginning of Lightfoot's essay is interesting: 'It is a fact now generally recognized by theologians of all shades of opinion that in the language of the New Testament the same officer in the Church is called indifferently "bishop" (*ἐπίσκοπος*) and "elder" or "presbyter" (*πρεσβύτερος*).'¹ It is curious that just after this strong assertion had been made—one quite justified—a new theory was started.

While it is true that bishops and presbyters were distinct in origin, it often happened that the same persons might be both bishops and presbyters. All bishops were perhaps presbyters; not all presbyters were bishops. Hence we must recognize a special class of presbyters, who might be described as 'presbyters who had oversight.'¹ This theory is further connected with the hypothesis that the name and office of bishop is derived from the finance officers of religious and other associations among the Greeks, and is intended to account for the growth of monarchical episcopacy by heathen analogies.²

The principal refutation of this theory lies in the careful examination of the passages already cited, made with a view to testing its validity. It will remain, we think, clear that the identity of presbyter and bishop holds, and that the presbyterate is plainly represented as an office. It is true that in two or three cases the double meaning of the word 'elder,' suggests the contrast of the younger men, but that is a literary association which would always be natural and does not interfere with the definite instances of the word being used of an office. Nor can the statement be substantiated that spiritual functions are not ascribed to presbyters. Not only do they occur, under the name of pastors (which Harnack admits to be a synonym), among those who have received spiritual gifts, but Timothy is particularly stated to have received the Spirit through the laying on of hands by the presbytery. On the other hand, the attempt to confine financial duties to the bishops equally fails, for the very first time that the presbyters are mentioned it is as receiving

¹ πρεσβύτεροι ἐπισκοποῦντες.

² A careful examination of Hatch's *Bampton Lectures* will make it apparent that this theory in no way really represents his views, and a number of passages might be quoted to this effect. What really happened was that his method of treatment, in which he separates the bishops and deacons from the presbyters, suggested this theory to Harnack, who developed it first in his German translation of Hatch and then in his edition of the *Didache*. The theory has been criticized, conclusively as to certain points in the opinion of the present writer, by Loening (*Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums*) and by Schmiedel in his article on the Ministry in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

contributions from Barnabas and Saul. Nor can any single passage be quoted which supports the existence of a special class of 'presbyters who have oversight,' or the existence of a college of bishops, side by side, with the college of presbyters. The whole theory will on examination be found to have no sound documentary basis.¹

We may pass on to consider another theory which has flourished somewhat widely in different forms—a refusal to allow the existence of presbyters in the Church until the close of the first century. To maintain this position it is necessary to hold that none of the books of the New Testament which contain any reference to presbyters belong to an earlier date. At that time or later the Acts of the Apostles, the Pastoral Epistles, the Epistle of James, and the first Epistle of Peter were all written, more or less in the interest of ecclesiasticism. They aim, like the Epistle of Clement, at giving Apostolic sanction to the bodies of presbyters or presbyter-bishops who were beginning to assert themselves. It is obvious that this theory depends upon a view of New Testament documents quite inconsistent with that taken in this article—a view which the present writer believes to be quite untenable. But, setting this aside, it may be asked, Are there any other reasons which may be alleged for or against the theory? On behalf of it, it is pointed out that in the generally accepted Epistles of St. Paul the name 'presbyter' does not occur. That is quite true. But it is an argument from silence which does not carry us very far. In the first place the office under other names is, as has been shewn, referred to both in Philippians and Ephesians. There

¹ The following statements of Schmiedel, which, like all his pronouncements, have the merit of being positive, may be quoted: 'Thus "presbyter" must be an official designation.' 'The word "presbyter" . . . denotes not merely some kind of office, but definitely that of *episcopus*.' 'Harnack's expression "presbyters functioning as *episcopi*" (*πρεσβύτεροι ἐπισκοποῦντες*) not only does not occur in the sources, but also is in contradiction with them.' 'Thus the synonyms also lead us to the conclusion already indicated, that the distinction between the function of church government by presbyters and that of administration of finance and worship by *episcopi* must be given up.' (*Enc. Bibl.* iii. 3137-3140. See also Loening, *Gemeindeverfassung*, p. 22 sq.)

remain the Epistles of the first and second groups. None of these documents deal with subjects relating to organization, and therefore the argument is of little value ; while it may be shewn that in these there are clear references to some offices or other in the local community. It has been pointed out that the letters are addressed to the Church in each case, or to the members of the Church as a whole, and not to the officers. But no deduction can be made from this. None of the letters of Ignatius are addressed to the officials of the Church, nor, still later, were those of Dionysius of Corinth. This argument from the silence of the earlier Pauline Epistles, the only one of any weight, is not of a character to justify us in condemning as historical forgeries all the documents which mention presbyters and claim to be earlier than the close of the first century.

But there are strong arguments on the other side. Speaking generally, the tendency of all the negative arguments is to read into the early Church the prejudices of modern theology. There is no evidence that there was ever any theological objection to presbyters, nor was either sacerdotalism or anti-sacerdotalism present. It is difficult to believe, for example, that St. Peter in his Epistle is trying to bolster up the authority of the presbyters when he tells them not to magnify their office unduly. Further than this the argument from later ecclesiastical conditions at a period when our information is fuller is against this view. While there is quite clearly a difference of custom as to monarchical episcopacy, there is none as to the presbyters. Wherever we have information from the beginning of the second century onwards the churches are governed by colleges of presbyters, whether with or without a president. About the name there may be a want of uniformity ; about the fact there is none. This community of custom certainly implies an early origin.

But perhaps the strongest corroborative evidence for the early date of the presbyterate lies in the most natural account of its origin. An attempt has indeed been made to find a Greek origin. It has been pointed out that in Greek inscriptions in Asia Minor and elsewhere 'elders' are mentioned.¹ No

¹ Evidence of the occurrence of the word *πρεσβύτεροι* in inscriptions

doubt this is true. The rule of the 'elders' is as wide as human nature. But the evidence is not in favour of any wide prevalence of the institution, nor is the analogy with the Christian institution at all close. It is a wise rule in historical research always to seek for the simplest explanation of an event or institution, and in this case there is a very simple one close at hand. We know that in all the Jewish communities of Palestine there were bodies of elders who took part in secular administration, and had a position of honour and dignity in the synagogue. It is exactly in accordance with all probability that the Christians, when expelled from the synagogue, should organize themselves in the same way. They would form a community very much on the same lines as that which they had left, and habit and custom would naturally make them call their officers by the name with which they were familiar. This exactly corresponds with the time and place in which, according to the testimony of our documents, the presbyterate arose. It has been wisely pointed out by Bishop Lightfoot that the reason why no account is given in the Acts of the appointment of presbyters is that nothing new happened. The Christians, being expelled from the synagogue, organized themselves as another synagogue. There was no new departure as there had been when the Seven were appointed, and therefore no record was thought worth preserving of what seemed so obvious and natural. And if this is so the name points decisively to Palestine. As we have pointed out in a former article, while the old Jewish word 'elder' was that which had prevailed in Palestine, it was the custom of the Jews in Greek countries to adopt a Greek method of speaking and to call their governing body *Gerousia* or senate, imitating Greek models. If the presbyters had been first appointed, as has been suggested, in

is given by Hatch, *op. cit.* pp. 65, 66, but it amounts to very little. It is strongly criticized by Loening, *op. cit.* pp. 64, 65, who supports very fully the derivation of the Christian 'presbyter' from the Jewish 'elder.' The theory of Hatch, and apparently of Schmiedel, is that in Jewish-Christian churches the 'presbyters' had a Greek origin; in Gentile churches they arose independently. This complicated theory has nothing to recommend it except that it is inconsistent with the Acts of the Apostles.

Asia Minor or among Gentile Churches, it is very unlikely that they would have obtained this name.

An argument which is now used against this view is that, whereas the Christian presbyter is entirely concerned with ecclesiastical matters, his Jewish prototype was primarily a secular officer. Although he had a position of honour and even authority in the synagogue, he was not the 'ruler of the synagogue.' It is argued, therefore, that the Jewish elder could not be the prototype of the Christian presbyter. This argument entirely overlooks the general character of the relation between Jewish and Christian institutions. It is not maintained that all the features of the new office were taken from the old, but only that the name and form of an institution were suggested by what the early Christians were accustomed to. The spirit was necessarily quite different. The relation is in fact a particular instance of that emancipation of Judaism which was accomplished in Christianity. Judaism was a nation and a church. The spiritual elements that made it a church were adopted by Christianity, which discarded the national idea. So, too, the Jewish communities in Palestine were partly secular, partly religious. Their officers had secular as well as spiritual functions. The Christian communities were entirely non-political, and the Jewish elder therefore became by a natural process of development the Christian presbyter.¹

We maintain, then, that all the evidence and the probabilities of the case point to the origin of Christian pres-

¹ The Jewish origin of the presbyterate is excellently expressed by Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, p. 60. 'Consequently, when the majority of the members of a Jewish community were convinced that Jesus was the Christ, there was nothing to interrupt the current of their former common life. There was no need for secession, for schism, for a change in the organization. The old form of worship and the old modes of government could still go on. . . . There is no trace of a break in the continuity: and there is consequently a strong presumption, which subsequent history confirms, that the officers who continued to bear the same names in the same community exercised functions closely analogous to those which they had exercised before; in other words, that the elders of the Jewish communities which had become Christian were, like the elders of the Jewish communities which remained Jewish, officers of administration and of discipline.'

byters in Palestine. They arose in Jewish soil at the time when the Christians, after the great breach with orthodox Judaism, were driven from the synagogues, and excommunicated by the Rabbis, and therefore compelled to organize themselves. These primitive communities could not have existed for six months without some sort of Church government, and the evidence of the documents which we possess exactly corresponds with the historical situation. The same organization which had grown up in Jerusalem and Judæa would naturally be carried forth by the Christian missionaries. It is probable that it existed at Antioch, although it is not mentioned. At any rate St. Paul was acquainted with it as the normal usage of the Christian Church, and when he has to commit the churches which he has founded to the divine guidance, he naturally gives them the form of government which custom had already justified. The body of elders or presbyters was the normal, if not the universal, form of government of the local community in the Apostolic times, subject always to the spiritual supremacy of the Apostles and prophets, through whom the community had received the word of God.

One further point remains in our investigation. What is the origin of the name 'Bishop'? It is well known that part of the theory originated by Dr. Hatch, and that on which personally he laid most stress, was that the name and office of bishop were derived from Greek models.¹ He pointed out that it occurred in inscriptions as the name of an office-bearer especially connected with finance in religious and other associations, and based his somewhat far-reaching

¹ The earlier usages of the word *ἐπίσκοπος* are summed up shortly but clearly by Lightfoot (*Philippians*, 95), who refers to several inscriptions. Renan first suggested the heathen associations as forming a model for the Gentile communities (*Les Apôtres*, p. 351 sq.), but Hatch first worked out the analogy at any length (*Bampton Lectures*, pp. 37, 38). His instances, when examined, form a very slight basis for his conclusions, and they are contested with success by Loening (*op. cit.* pp. 20, 22): 'Aus dieser Uebersicht dürfte sich wohl mit Sicherheit ergeben, dass die Behauptung von Hatch, in den Genossenschaften und Städten Kleinasiens und Syriens hätten die Finanzbeamten den Titel *ἐπίσκοπος* geführt, nicht erwiesen ist.' See also Armitage Robinson, art. 'Bishop' in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, i. 578 sq.

conclusions on this fact. The evidence which he used has since been examined, and on examination appears much slighter than was at first thought. No doubt, as Bishop Lightfoot had pointed out beforehand, the word *episkopos* had been used not uncommonly in Greek communities. Every word, or almost every word, adopted by Christians had been so used. But this does not necessarily imply a Greek origin. Moreover, the word is quite common in the Septuagint, which was a much more likely source for the early Christians to draw from than the somewhat obscure heathen associations. Just as the presbyters were called pastors or shepherds because their duty was to tend the flock of Christ—a metaphor common in the Old Testament, and occurring in some very striking passages—so they were called bishops or overseers because their duty was that of overseeing or ruling the flock. Christ was the true Shepherd and chief Bishop of His people, and those appointed to guard the flock fulfilled the same functions. And there were favourite texts which supported this view. Of Judas, St. Peter quotes the words: 'His bishoprick let another take'¹; while in the letter of Clement of Rome we find a passage quoted in a form which shews the influence of Christian usage: 'I will appoint their bishops in righteousness and their deacons in faith.'² While the word 'presbyter' was naturally used technically within the Christian Church, it was equally natural to St. Paul, especially when writing or speaking to those not of Jewish origin, to use more explanatory terms, which might bring out the functions of the Church officers. Just as the Jews in Gentile countries spoke of their Senate as their Rulers, so there was a tendency, especially in Gentile Churches, to speak of the presbyters by the more descriptive names of bishops or occasionally pastors.

We should have to pass beyond the evidence at our command if we attempted to describe the functions of the presbyters at the period when they were first appointed in any but general

¹ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λαβέτω ἕτερος, Acts i. 20; Ps. cix. (cviii.) 8.

² Clem. Rom. xlii. : καταστήσω τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει. Is. lx. 17; καὶ δώσω τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.

language. It may, however, be safe to say that they were the chief officers of the local churches. Probably the statement of the *Didache*,¹ that they performed in each place the functions of prophets, and teachers, is true for the early as well as for a somewhat later date. They were the administrators of the community, and so to them the Apostles bring the gifts of other Churches. They would have the seat of honour in the assemblies, and would preside over it, and, if there were no prophets or teachers present, would take the lead in the worship of the Church and in the Eucharistic service. As overseers and shepherds, they were to be ensamples to the flock, to tend it, to guard it from evil, and when the Chief Shepherd should appear they would receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away.²

IV.

We have examined the various ways in which the Church adapted its organization to the new condition of affairs which arose so rapidly; we must now turn back to the Church at Jerusalem and to the Apostles and ask what position they occupy in the altered circumstances. Do they retain that position of supremacy which they clearly occupied during the early days of the Church?

The narrative which we possess clearly puts them in a place of authority. At every crisis in affairs, according to the Acts, they take the lead. When Philip converts the Samaritans, the Apostles at Jerusalem send down Peter and John. Saul, after his conversion, is taken by Barnabas to the Apostles. Peter has to give an account of the baptism of Cornelius to the Apostles and brethren in Judæa. When difficulties arise with Jewish Christians the Church at Antioch sends Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to the Apostles and presbyters. Throughout this period the Acts recognizes the supremacy of the Apostles at Jerusalem. Nor can there be any doubt that this view is the correct one. It is

¹ *Didache*, 15: ὑμῖν γὰρ λειτουργοῦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων.

² Acts xx. 28-31; 1 Peter v. 1-4.

entirely corroborated by St. Paul's language and actions. Much in the Epistle to the Galatians is obscure, but what is quite clear is, that whatever opinions St. Paul may have held as to the authority of the Apostles in Jerusalem, that authority was recognized in the Church, and it was necessary for the full success of his work that it should be accepted by them. They are those who are held to have position.¹ James and Cephas and John are reputed to be pillars.² They are the authority with which he has to arrange terms, who give him the right hand of fellowship, with whom it is decided that they shall go to the Circumcision and he to the Uncircumcision. So again, when he claims for himself the privileges of an Apostle, he asserts that he has the same rights and privileges as those who were before him. 'Am I not free? Am I not an Apostle? . . . Have we no right to lead about a sister, a wife, even as the rest of the Apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?'³ His claim throughout is to be on the level of the older Apostles, and the claim which he makes proves the position that they held. All our evidence, whether of the Acts or the Epistles, proves the leading position of the Apostles.

The position of importance occupied by St. Peter and in a less degree by St. John still remains. As the former had been the leader in the primitive community, so he seems to have been the leader in missionary enterprise, and records of his work in this direction have been preserved. It was he who took the first step towards admitting into the Church Gentiles who were not circumcised, and his work in preaching to the Jews won him the title of 'Apostle of the Circumcision.'⁴ But, however prominent may have been his position, he had no supremacy. We are clearly told that the Apostles sent Peter and John to Samaria,⁵ and later Peter is called upon to give an account to the Apostles and brethren of his action in baptizing Cornelius.⁶ Supremacy lies in the hands of the Church acting through the Apostles as a body.

But while the position of the Apostles remains, a change

¹ Gal. ii. 6: οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι.

² Ib. ii. 9: οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι.

⁴ Gal. ii. 8.

⁵ Acts viii. 14.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 1, 5.

⁶ Ib. xi. 1-3.

comes over the Church at Jerusalem, which is undoubted as an historical fact, although its origin and to a certain extent its character must remain largely a matter of conjecture. We find that a leading position in the Church is occupied by James, the Lord's brother, and associated with the Apostles are presbyters. At the time of the Council the Acts no longer speaks of the Apostles only, but of the Apostles and presbyters, while the place of president seems to be occupied by James. What is the meaning of these changes?

From the Resurrection onwards, as we know from the combined testimony of the Acts and St. Paul, the brethren of the Lord occupied a place of honour and distinction in the Christian Church. Among these St. James is most prominent. From the time of the persecution of Herod he seems to preside over the Church at Jerusalem. St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Galatians, mentions James before Cephas and John,¹ while later tradition remembers and exaggerates his position. According to Hegesippus, 'James, the brother of the Lord, succeeded to the government of the Church in conjunction with the Apostles.'² According to Clement of Alexandria and later writers, he was Bishop of Jerusalem. Hegesippus adds some curious traditions about him. 'He was holy from his mother's womb; he drank no wine nor strong drink, he ate no flesh; no razor ever touched his head; he did not anoint himself with oil, and did not use the public bath. He alone was permitted to enter into the holy place; for he wore not woollen but linen garments.' The first part of this tradition suggests that he was a Nazarite ascetic, the latter that he was a Jewish High Priest. The Clementine literature still further exaggerates the position of James, representing him as 'Bishop of Bishops.'

There can be no doubt that in the early days of Christianity the character and influence of James were of great importance. He was a stout adherent of the Law, he was ascetic in his life; and these two facts made him extremely popular with the mass of the people. It was not until the breaking up of all law and order that the extreme party were strong enough to vent their hatred upon him. But, on the other hand, he was a

¹ Gal. i. 19; ii. 9.

² Hegesippus, *ap.* Euseb. *H.E.* ii. 23.

Christian—a Christian who was willing to accept the new conditions. He gave the right hand of fellowship to St. Paul ; he attempted to conciliate the Jews at Jerusalem to him, by suggesting a scheme which might shew his loyalty to Jewish customs. Head, at any rate in some sense, of the Church at Jerusalem, regarded with respect by the most prejudiced Jewish Christians and by many Jews, he used his powerful influence to keep the Church together, and helped to prevent any such division in its early days as might have been fatal to its existence.

But it is more difficult to obtain an accurate idea of his constitutional position. Perhaps in its origin it was a special appointment arising out of his reputed relationship to our Lord. Renan compares the position of the family of Mahomet in the early Caliphate, and the analogy is to a certain extent a good one. It has been suggested that he was made one of the Twelve when James the brother of John was killed. It is perhaps the case that he attained his position owing to the persecution of Herod, which made Jerusalem too dangerous a place for the Apostles. But there are elements in the later tradition which may help us to a solution. Not only is St. James spoken of in the way that we have quoted, but Eusebius also quotes a passage from Polycrates of Ephesus which speaks of St. John as a 'priest who wore the mitre.'¹ Do not these instances suggest that there was at any rate a tendency among a section of Christians to look upon the High Priest and Sanhedrin as the proper models to follow. We have seen that when the Christians were expelled from the synagogues they did what was quite natural : they founded communities of their own on the analogy of those they had left. So, when they were cut off from the fellowship of Israel after the flesh, they would naturally model their society as a whole on the analogy of the Jewish nation. If this be so, the Apostles and presbyters at Jerusalem would be looked upon, not by all Christians but by some, as the Sanhedrin of the Christians. James was in the position of the Christian High Priest. Traces of this conception have then been preserved in Christian tradition.

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24.

That St. John wore the mitre, that St. James entered the Holy Place, may be dismissed as legendary embellishments; but the fact which probably underlies them is that the Jewish Christians loved to think of the Apostles as the actual inheritors of the position of the High Priests and elders at Jerusalem, that a Christian Judaism had been their ideal, that they had seen in the Council of the Apostles and presbyters at Jerusalem a Christian Sanhedrin.

It was natural that so long as Jerusalem was standing it should be the local centre of the new religion. 'Jerusalem is the mother of us all' was the cry of the Galatian Judaizers. To Jerusalem the thoughts of Christians were directed, and to Jerusalem questions were naturally referred. In this way rose the first Christian Council at which the Apostles and presbyters had to decide upon the great question of the admission of the Gentiles. But it was soon clear that the new religion had in it elements of life and power which would break through these barriers. The work was done for it by quite external forces. St. Paul must have chafed under the influence of the narrow party at Jerusalem which had to be conciliated, but he had the statesmanlike instinct which told him that at any sacrifice but that of principle the unity of the Church must be preserved. Even in his lifetime the growth of the Gentile churches had made the influence of Jerusalem less and less important, and the fall of the city swept away all the old conditions.

The constitution of the Church at Jerusalem, then, was something abnormal, something which, in its origin, belonged to a temporary stage in the history of the Church. The 'Seven' were appointed to meet an emergency. The presbyters with the Apostles were modelled on the Jewish Sanhedrin. James was a Christian High Priest and owed his unique position to his reputed relationship to the Founder of Christianity. None of these conditions could be repeated. But at the same time the organization of the Church at Jerusalem suggests an exact resemblance to that in later days of bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and it is not improbable that this analogy assisted in the building up of the later organization of the Church.

There was an old tradition that the Apostles remained at Jerusalem twelve years, and this date fairly represents the facts which seem indicated by the narrative in the Acts. Certainly after the year 44 they no longer appear to be resident there. During the first portion of this period the Church was small, was for the most part confined to Jerusalem, and had realized little of its potentialities. With the preaching of Stephen and the persecution which followed, it began to develop its true functions. It now became a missionary Church. During the first period the only officers of the Church, so far as we know, were the Apostles. Altered circumstances created new conditions, and the Church shaped itself with divine force to its new duties. The Christian missionaries sprang up with wonderful energy. Expelled from the synagogues, the communities were organized on the old models. The Apostles at Jerusalem became the directors of communities which spread throughout Palestine and Syria, which had reached Antioch, and, although predominantly Jewish, had begun to include Gentiles. But the force which had been stirred could not be restrained by any narrow barriers. A new and stronger and more vigorous Christianity was to grow out of the old, was to take up and expand all the elements of life and organization which had been created, and, while never severing its connexion with the primitive Churches, was to create the world-wide society of Gentile Christianity.

ART. II.—MISSIONS IN NYASALAND, I.

1. *British Central Africa*. By Sir HARRY H. JOHNSTON K.C.B., etc. (Methuen and Co., 1897.)
2. *Dr. Livingstone's Cambridge Lectures*. Edited by the Rev. WM. MONK, M.A. (Deighton Bell and Co., 1858.)
3. *The History of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, 1859-1896*. By A. E. M. ANDERSON-MORSHEAD. (Universities Mission to Central Africa, 1897.)
4. *How we Stand after Twenty-five Years*. By the Rev. A. HETHERWICK, D.D. (Published by the Blantyre Mission, British Central Africa, 1902.)
5. *Dawn in the Dark Continent*. Being the Duff Missionary Lectures for 1902. By the Rev. JAMES STEWART, D.D., (Edinburgh : Oliphant Anderson and Ferrier, 1903.)
6. *Fourth Report on Foreign Missions to the General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland*. (Published by T. and A. CONSTABLE, for the United Free Church of Scotland, 1904.)
7. *Five Years' Medical Work on Lake Nyasa*. By ROBERT HOWARD, M.B., B.Ch. (Oxon.). (U.M.C.A., 1904.)
8. *Report of the Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland*. Given in by the Very Rev. JOHN MCMURTRIE, D.D. Official, May 1905.

THERE might seem almost to be need of an apology for drawing attention to so small a corner as that indicated in our title. Only fifty years ago Nyasa was unknown, unheard of except by vague rumours of a large inland sea, while Livingstone was as yet wandering about the upper reaches of the Zambesi, and exploring northwards, much more to the west than Lake Nyasa—making incidentally such discoveries as that of the Victoria Falls, seeing everything, noting everything, and drawing beyond the limits of his actual observations sound conclusions which later exploration has confirmed and certified. There are many still living who remember the excitement in England in 1857, when Livingstone returned after an absence of sixteen years, and to not a few the

thrill of the great meeting he addressed in Cambridge is still a powerful spring of action. Many explorers have returned from their newly explored countries to find England ready to hang on their lips, but it may be doubted if any man has had quite the reception which Livingstone won. His words as one reads them after fifty years are, as he himself said, not fluent nor fired with eloquence, and they seem inadequate to the result they have produced; but the man behind the words and the singularity of the occasion—a Scottish Presbyterian appealing to the English Universities and the English Church—were a force the influence of which has never died away.

The immediate response to his appeal was the formation of committees in Cambridge and Oxford, and the sending out, as soon as men and means were forthcoming, of the first missionary band, with Bishop Mackenzie as its head, to evangelize the tribes living about Lake Nyasa and the Shiré. An account of this attempt may be read in the excellent history of the Universities' Mission, and full details may be found in Mr. Rowley's *Twenty Years in Central Africa*, and in Bishop Tozer's Letters.

Here we propose to speak mainly of the existing conditions and the existing work of the various societies. It is necessary, however, just to summarize the story of the early beginnings as briefly as possible. The Universities' Mission made its first attempt under Mackenzie in 1861; Mackenzie died early in 1862; Bishop Tozer, his successor, with Dr. Steere, reached the scene in 1863, withdrew to Zanzibar in 1864, and from that date till 1875 no other attempt was made by missionary, administration, or trader to settle in Nyasaland. In 1875 the Free Church of Scotland (now the United Free Church) sent out a party who settled on the shores by the lake and have never gone back. The same year Steere, now Bishop in succession to Bishop Tozer, reached Mataka's village, about seventy miles east of Nyasa, and in the following year the established Church of Scotland founded Blantyre. In 1877 the African Lakes Company made the first trading venture; in 1880 the Rev. W. P. Johnson, of the Universities' Mission, settled at Mataka's village. There has been no more retreating, and it is the development

and work of these missions to which we desire to call attention in this and the following article.

Let it be remembered that our subject is a work for which, so far as we can see, there was no preparation from within either in the history of the people or in the activity of their own minds, and that it is with a force operating from the outside that we have to do. We must look, therefore, not for a scientific study of a work approaching its final stages, but rather for a free statement of difficulties as yet to a large extent unsolved. Missions, in Nyasaland at least, can hardly be said to have passed beyond the experimental stage, and it is too early as yet to draw conclusions and to lay down laws.

The standard work on the country is Sir H. H. Johnston's *British Central Africa*, and as the shore of the Nyasa lake is British almost from end to end on the west side and for a part also of the east side, and Sir Harry Johnston's knowledge of the country is by no means confined to the British territory, his account may be taken as giving a very faithful picture of the whole mission field which we are considering. It is just necessary here to say that Lake Nyasa lies in the eastern half of the great central plateau of Africa, that its height above sea-level is about 1,500 feet, and that it is surrounded by an irregular line of mountains advancing in some parts close to the lake shores, at others retiring five or six or more miles. The lake is about 350 miles long, very deep in places, and its waters are deliciously fresh. The outflow is at the south end by the Shiré River to the Zambesi, and so into the Indian Ocean, and this waterway is the only highway of traffic to and from the outer world. On account of this latter fact we shall include among the missions of Nyasaland those which work in the Shiré highlands along this highway from the south.

The climate in Nyasaland proper is a very delightful one—with drawbacks. Though the lake is cut into two nearly equal parts by the twelfth parallel of south latitude and the whole country is well within the tropics, the heat is never insufferable and cold weather is unknown. The range of temperature for the whole year inside a house at Likoma, an

island half-way up the lake, is stated to be from 70° to 90° . The elevation above sea-level and the presence of so large a body of water doubtless account for the moderate degree of heat in so tropical a situation. The first impression which one gets is that life in such a climate must be a continual picnic, and so to a great extent it is. But there are serious drawbacks—just as there were in the delightful land in which Kingsley's Do-nothings lived on flapdoodle—and the most serious hitherto is the unaccountable difficulty which Europeans find in keeping free from malaria and its consequences. We say 'unaccountable' because of the capriciousness of disease in attacking one and leaving another, and also because it really does at first seem incredible that anyone should find any excuse whatever for being ill. With regard to this question of health it is difficult to say much more than that closer attention to preventive precautions and fuller knowledge, if not of the genesis, at least of the modes of transmission, of malaria have distinctly raised the average of health and diminished the mortality both from malaria and hæmoglobinuria. Less than ten years ago it was possible to reproach missions—particularly, perhaps, the Universities' Mission—with almost criminal carelessness in these matters of health. That it is so no longer is largely due to the work of advisory Medical Boards, and to the skill and care of the doctors and nurses on the spot. A most valuable contribution to the knowledge of the conditions of health is Dr. Howard's *Report of Five Years' Work on Lake Nyasa*, and the general impression which Dr. Howard leaves with the reader is that there are no health difficulties which are not in a fair way to be overcome. It is most satisfactory to see that the health question is no longer being ignored by the Universities' Mission, and that already such wonderful results have followed on the vigorous application of sound common sense and the latest scientific knowledge to such an important side of all mission work. There may be differences of opinion as to the value of dead missionaries, but there is no manner of doubt that sick or sickly ones are of very little use.

The great discovery of its complicity in the transmission of malaria has set on foot a vigorous crusade against the

mosquito, and the immediate result is that fever-haunted regions are already beginning to be habitable by those who will observe the simple and widely published rules of health drawn up by the doctors ; so that we may fairly dismiss the climate of Nyasaland with a word of praise for its outward charm and of strong hope for the speedy disappearance of its hidden dangers.

Before turning to the description of missionary work in Nyasaland, we must add to the above brief description of existing physical conditions a word or two about the political situation. Nyasaland at the present time is divided between the three European Powers, Great Britain, Germany, and Portugal. There are definite boundaries and no debatable borderland of uncertain ownership. The British and the Germans have effectively occupied practically the whole of their territories for years past, but the Portuguese, notwithstanding their long start of hundreds of years in East Africa, cannot as yet be said to have occupied much beyond the fringe of the East Coast (*i.e.* the Indian Ocean Coast, not Nyasaland at all), and another fringe along the banks of the Shiré.

On Lake Nyasa itself four years ago the Portuguese had not as yet been seen ; now they are represented by a Commandante and one or two non-commissioned underlings, with a handful of trained native soldiers from the coast. The west coast is British up to almost the northernmost point ; the east coast is German from the north to nearly half-way down the lake, and Portuguese from this German boundary to the English territory, which comes round the south end and extends northwards along about one-fifth of the east side. The only important fact to notice for the present is that as Nyasaland stands now the greater part of it is more or less in a settled state, and is firmly administered. The point comes home in the statement that the traveller can now pass secure and without arms, except for purposes of sport, through the whole country. As for missions, all the three Powers concerned are under treaty obligations to protect the missionaries and to put no hindrance in the way of their work ; so that missionary work there is in these days robbed of the charm that a spice of danger gives.

We can now draw a little closer to our subject. Who are the people for whom all this missionary and other work is primarily undertaken? What are the races and what the characteristics of the natives in Nyasaland? All the tribes of Nyasaland belong to the great Bantu Negro family of races, who extend over almost all the country from the Equator to the Cape. They are not correctly described as Negroes, though the differences are not very easily perceived by the uninstructed eye, and the name Bantu, which is generally used of all the negroid races south of the Equator, is properly a name based on linguistic resemblances and differences rather than on racial ones. The chief tribes of Nyasaland proper are the Wa-Nyanja or lake people, the Yaos, and the Ngoni-Zulus. In the first of these classes are comprised several tribes speaking different but related languages and known by various names, such as the Wa-Tonga, the Wa-Chewa, the Wa-Konde, the Amang'anja. The Yaos, who in British Central Africa are, strictly speaking, invaders of the Nyasaland territories of comparatively recent date—the very invaders, in fact, whose first arrival made the Shire highlands untenable by Bishop Mackenzie and his little band in 1861—seem to be fairly homogeneous both in physical characteristics and in language, so that it has been affirmed that the Yao language is practically without dialects over an enormous stretch of country. The Ngoni, who are often, but incorrectly, called Angoni, are an invading tribe of Zulus who almost within the historical period of this newly discovered country have made their way up from the south, and after passing the lake on the west have apparently been turned back by some cause and have sent a branch down again southwards to the east of Lake Nyasa, where they are generally known as Magwangara, though the native speech of East Nyasa calls them there also Ngoni.

For the purpose of our survey it will be necessary to confine ourselves principally to the missions among the Wa-Nyanja and the Yaos. And it will be to these tribes that the descriptions of character, customs, and culture will directly apply. The Ngoni may be dismissed quickly with the statement that they are rather a ruling caste which

has settled in a conquered country than an indigenous people—they are like the Normans in Plantagenet England, not the native Saxons and Celts. The Nyasa tribes, generally speaking, are of a good dark-brown colour, a black with a brown (and not a blue) foundation, and there are, of course, as many shades among black complexions as are found among the white ones of any mixed assembly. The hair is always black and woolly, and it is usual to shave the head entirely at frequent intervals. These people, though they have a great regard for the beard as an ornament, have not been allowed by Nature to attain, as a rule, to more than a few straggling hairs on the chin or upper lip. In stature they belong to the taller races of the world, and the average height is certainly not below that of the English. One seldom sees a really fat native, and the legs in particular are generally rather long in proportion and are lean and muscular.

The Bantu languages are all of the agglutinative type—that is, they are built up of prefix and affix and inset particles. This is an earlier form of speech than the inflected, and it is probable that most languages have passed through this stage. The great difference which strikes people accustomed only to the inflected language of the higher stages of development is that the changes are made not by inflection with meaningless particles and amorphous endings but by the mere putting together side by side of particles which bear some resemblance to words. It is, so to speak, a mechanical mixture that has taken place, and not yet a chemical one. The elements of speech are not worn down into hopelessly unrecognizable shapes. From the point of view not of a scientific student of languages but of the practical missionary the important fact about these languages is that they are not very difficult to learn. They present none of the difficulties which the languages of the East present, and the main requirement for the learner is a quick ear and a good memory. It is not intended to affirm that the *mastery* of the language is an easy matter at all, but simply that a good working knowledge for practical purposes can be acquired by ordinary people. The language has been reduced to writing by the missionaries, the Free Church of

Scotland—we mean, of course, the United Free Church—being the pioneer in this work, while the alphabet adopted by all missions has been the simple, almost phonetic one which Bishop Steere used in his work in Zanzibar and at the coast. It is not the most scientific one, and for scientific purposes it will always be necessary to use a special set of signs, such as the alphabet of Leipsius or that of Meinhof; but for ordinary use the alphabet adopted is the best, as combining some approach to accuracy of relation between sound and symbol without perplexing the poor native or the ordinary unscientific learner with a large number of new symbols. To the natives, of course, all the symbols are new, since they had no written language and no literature at all before the advent of the white men; but that is, as Bishop Steere thought, no reason for attempting to inflict upon them different symbols for every separate shade of pronunciation of, let us say, the vowel *o*.

One sometimes hears these Bantu languages spoken of as being very poor and deficient in means of expression. Without going to the other extreme and asserting that the Bantus have in their agglutinative tongue an instrument for the expression of thought which may be compared, for example, with such flexible languages as English or Greek, it does yet seem necessary to state that the Bantus are born orators, and that for their purpose they find their language very adequate; that moreover in the matter of vocabulary they are provided with a great and comparatively unexplored number of words; and that in the things which closely concern their own life and work they seem to have more names for objects than one finds in English. But for flowers and such (practically) useless things as butterflies and insects they have naturally very few names. For trees and plants which are in any way useful to man they have everywhere plenty of names. For abstract ideas, especially foreign abstract ideas, they have naturally again little use and few names, and it is this lack which is likely to strike the foreigner first. That there is any poorness in their vocabulary or any lack of words to describe the things they want to describe or to convey the ideas they want to express, that there is any poverty or insufficiency

in their means of communication with one another or any ambiguity beyond what is inevitable in their forms of speech, these are the careless libels of the superficial observer. We have spent so long on this matter of the language because language is one of the most important criteria of culture, and it is necessary to vindicate the Bantu tribes from the slander of being raised very little above the brute in so important a particular.

The tribes of Nyasa have advanced for the most part beyond the stage in which the ordinary occupation is a pastoral one, though there are pastoral tribes among them, notably the Wa-Konde, in North-West Nyasa. The Wa-Nyanja are all agricultural people, living in simple settlements of houses built of no better materials than reed and grass and mud. The men are chiefly concerned with fishing, and the necessary works attendant on fishing. Among the Yaos, who live away from the lake, as a rule, there is naturally no fishing to speak of, and it is usual to find these capable people quite helpless with the common canoe which every lake-side boy learns to use from his infancy. The men in this case find the outlet for their skill and capacity in building better houses than are generally seen among the Wa-Nyanja, and in hunting and a more varied agriculture. An index of the development of the race is supplied by the arts which are practised outside the line of those necessary to existence, and in this connexion it may be recorded that iron smelting and forging are practised; that the women make and burn a simple kind of pottery; that a strong but coarse cloth was formerly woven in many districts from the native grown cotton, until this industry gave way before the enormous importation of calicoes from Manchester for purposes of barter; that besides this woven cloth a good use is made of a hammered-out bark-cloth, and that the fishing industry is supplied in each village with its nets and canoes by the local enterprise and skill of the families living together.

It will be seen at once that these people are not very low down in the scale of culture, and that though they may be classed with savage races, they are at any rate high up in their class. They are, for instance, higher than the North American

Indian, higher than the lower tribes found in India, far higher than the Bushman and Hottentot, and than the black-fellow of Australia. In the matter of their social arrangements they are backward, if it be permitted to dogmatize so far on the vexed question of what is forward and what is backward in the line of social development. The unit of society is the family, not the individual; the only political cohesion is within the limits of the blood tie, more or less; the tracing of descent is through the mother and not through the father, though the father is known, recognized, and honoured in some respects above the maternal relations. For instance, if a native sneezes it is because the ancestral spirit of his father's line has visited him with a blessing, and the beneficiary must not omit to express audibly his thanks to the spirit by name. Such social arrangements as polygamy and slavery are the invariable rule with these people, and it must be a long time before any leavening with Christianity can be expected to do away with them.

The slave trade is now a dangerous and moribund occupation, thanks to the energetic action of the European Powers, and especially, of course, of the British. But domestic slavery is another thing altogether, and is so much a part of the social fabric that it cannot disappear until some other arrangements come to take its place. Polygamy, the greatest difficulty with which the missionary has to contend and that which causes more than anything else the back-sliding of his converts, is probably doomed from natural causes to an earlier extinction than the domestic slavery we have referred to. The cessation under the European hand of the inter-tribal wars and of the slave trade, which were among the great thinning-out forces, and which probably tended to reduce the proportion of males to females, has made for an increase of population and for a higher proportion of marriageable males in the total population, so that this natural cause alone would probably in time make polygamy rarer. Add to this the great effect of Christian teaching, and a gradual raising of the position of woman, and it may seem not too sanguine to hope for a speedier removal of this great evil. That polygamy is a great evil and a great

cause of backwardness in a race should not need any support from detailed argument in this Review.

The religion of the Bantu tribes, and among them of all the tribes in Nyasaland, is that to which Professor Tylor has given the name of 'animism.' But since animism, as used by Professor Tylor, is a comprehensive term, it is necessary to explain more fully the religious ideas of these natives. They have a belief, of which some few traces can be found, in a Supreme Spirit, or at any rate a Great Spirit, but they seem to recognize Him only in the startling manifestations of Nature. For ordinary every-day purposes the lesser spirits, whether of their ancestry or those attached in some way to natural objects, are of much more importance to them. One hesitates to affirm that their attitude towards these is *only* one of fear, but there can be no doubt that their chief concern with them is to keep on good terms. It would perhaps be safe to say that among the spirits as among men there are friends and foes, and that a man's normal attitude to the spirits which are in direct relation with him, such as those of his ancestors, would naturally be a friendly one, and that he would look to them for protection and help. This would lead him to make offerings to them, as in fact he does. On the other hand there are the spirits which are in relation equally direct with his neighbours and enemies. What is his attitude likely to be with regard to these? He will certainly fear them and be suspicious of them, and he may be led to propitiate them, or his dealings with them may take the form of enlisting against them any spirits which he regards as his friends. He is certainly in an habitual state of fear of spirits that may work him mischief, and he has constant recourse to charms and spells for his protection from the unseen terrors which lie about his path. Moreover, this part of his religious system is the one which first attracts the observer's attention, and may easily pass for the whole. There are, however, other parts to the system, and the dances and initiation ceremonies are no doubt connected rather with friendly spirits than with the hostile and malignant ones. But these are of the nature of mysteries, and it is difficult to get any insight into them, just because they are the property of the

tribe and the outsider has nothing to do with them. The belief in spirits which have connexion rather with places and natural objects is evidenced by the offerings which the natives place near certain trees wherever they may find them, and by their fear of a sort of tale-bearing spirit able, for instance, to warn the fish in the lake of the intention to set a net for them; and these it is necessary to deceive by indirect ways of alluding to the work. For example, a man who has set a net in a certain place will be careful not to say so on his return to the village, but will say that he has been throwing his *rubbish* into the lake. So also he will not invite his partner in the venture to go and look at their net to-morrow, if that is the day he means to go, but he will cautiously ask him to go and look at the *rubbish* on the *day after to-morrow*. There is some idea not perhaps of immortality but certainly of the survival of a spirit for some time after death, and it is probable that this survival lasts as long as there is anything to remind the survivors of the departed. The spirit of a great chief will naturally be remembered much longer than the spirit of a slave, and will be more likely to revisit in dreams those who remember him; and so we find that the ceremonies connected with the death and burial of a chief last much longer than those for a slave or for a mere child.

But these details do not belong to our subject, except in so far as they throw light on the native ideas which the missionaries have to encounter in their work. Witchcraft, both white and black—that is, both for the purpose of averting mischief and for the purpose of causing mischief—is very prevalent, and the native may be said to live in continual fear on this score at least. Cannibalism is held in the greatest abhorrence, but is not unknown. Those who practise black witchcraft are accused of causing death, not only to harm their enemies but also to gratify their unnatural desire for human flesh; and it seems as though there undoubtedly exists a sort of secret society of ghoulish beings pledged to the eating of human flesh, and to other hideous orgies by night. At any rate there can be no doubt that the native belief in the existence of such people is of the very strongest, and the suspected are alike feared and hated, so that it is

only a few years since the penalty for such a crime against society was burning alive. How long is it since that was also a penalty for witchcraft in Christian countries? Not so long ago that we can afford to throw stones at the African!

There are also sacrifices, and these generally take the form of offerings to the dead. The departed spirits are accustomed to make known their need of gifts—food, drink, cloth, ivory—by appearing in dreams to some one of their surviving descendants. Apart from such special demands it would be usual for a man returning, let us suppose, from Fort Salisbury or Buluwayo, not only to make presents of cloth to his living relations, but also to hang similar gifts in the neighbourhood of the graves of his ancestors. The occasion of an offering of food and drink to the spirits is also the occasion of dancing and singing, and of sharing the food and drink of the spirits.

Of totemism such as appears among the American Indians and some Polynesians there seems to be no evidence, but there are many existing facts which may perhaps be explained by the hypothesis of an earlier totemistic stage—such facts as the presence of domestic animals, some forbidden foods, the belief in a transmigration of human spirits into the bodies of beasts, the wonderful stories of beasts, and some survivals of taboo. We do not, however, think that these facts necessitate a totemistic explanation, and it would seem equally possible to account for them on totally different hypotheses.

Such are the conditions—physical, political, social, and religious—in which the Central African missionary has to work. It will not be out of place here to say a word or two about the character of the natives themselves. They are not lazy, but they are not driven by that fear of 'the devil taking the hindmost' which in the struggle for existence has for centuries been compelling us Europeans into restless energy; nor are they generally even idle, though they certainly have at present a greater gift for doing nothing than the bustling Western. They are not, again, contemplative mystics like the Hindoo. On the contrary they are by nature most practical, and will, we think, as wants

increase, be found to follow the line of development of the Western rather than the Eastern races. They are not critical or scientific, or rather their science is not progressive and inquisitive, but they learn quickly to value and use the complex instruments of the white man. They are patient under suffering with the patience of the ass crouching under its burden, but they are not patient to achieve. They are warmly affectionate and grateful, but these feelings in them have the faults which one looks for in children's feelings; they are docile, cheerful, incapable of deep and lasting resentment; they are as a rule clean but not tidy; they are modest and generally truthful, except where the truth is at variance with the duty to the clan; they are certainly honest among themselves and capable of unflinching honesty in their master's interest, but the community life of their village and families makes them less keen about individual rights than the white man. Their wits are often very acute, especially in childhood, and there is no physical bar to the indefinite development of their intellect. Finally, they are a growing and increasing race, not, like the aborigines of America and Australia, dying out before the higher civilization, but rather advancing in numbers and in powers, rising by conflict and contact with that higher civilization—a race, in fact, of great promise.

How shall this growing and promising race be taught to advance on the lines of true progress? We propose to consider what missions are working in these conditions, and what answer may be found to this question in their methods and results.

We may dismiss first of all in a word or two certain bodies calling themselves industrial missions. These societies may do excellent work, but they are rather outside our purview here because they professedly keep the industrial and profit-making side of the work first, and let the missionary one come in incidentally. There is, therefore, no advantage for our present purpose in a special study of their methods or results, because the issues are not the simple missionary issues.

Next we come to the Moravian Mission, which is at work

in the German territory north-west of the lake. We place this second not because it has any nearer affinity with the industrial missions than those which we shall take later on, but because its work is smaller and simpler and can be considered here very briefly. The Moravian Church—or the United Brethren as they are, strictly speaking, called—is the oldest and most zealous of all missionary bodies. The United Brethren were the first society to send a missionary in modern times into the darkness of Africa, and it is said that one in every sixty of their communicants becomes a missionary. Theirs is the missionary body *par excellence*, and their work moreover seems to be carried on upon sound lines, apart from the fundamental questions which differentiate them from the Catholic Church. The present writer cannot speak from personal knowledge of their missions in Nyasaland, but it has been his happiness to know individual missionaries and to compare notes away from the field of labour itself, and he has been struck by the wise caution which they seem to use in the admission of converts to their body. They aim at working in as inexpensive a manner as possible, and the mission staff includes artisans and agriculturists ; but they do not aim at profit-making or put their missionary message into any but the first place. It is said by so experienced an observer as Dr. Stewart, who has moreover had the chance of seeing Moravians at work both in South and Central Africa, that their system gives less individual freedom than is common in other Churches, and that consequently their converts remain rather like children dependent on the guiding hand of their teachers. Their extraordinary realization of the missionary duty of the Church is the grand point in the Moravian Society, and we would that the other Churches might drink of the spirit that is animating this little body.

Next in order we take the Roman Missions, again because they can be described briefly. It must be premised in our review of the work and methods of the different missions that there are really no opportunities of seeing the missions in question at work side by side on the same material and in the same conditions. The White Fathers are working in the north-west of Nyasaland, where the conditions and the

problems resemble generally those under consideration ; but their work strictly belongs to the Tanganyika country rather than to Nyasaland. Their strong stations are generally industrial, and their communities include laymen and nuns among the workers. The special feature of the Roman Missions is that the members go out for life, and are only accepted after a severe and prolonged training at home—a training which begins very early in the candidate's life. Their attitude towards the special questions of polygamy and slavery and the native initiation ceremonies appears to be somewhat more lax than that of the other missions, and it is to some extent their custom to begin their work in a new district with a nucleus of slaves whom they have redeemed or bought, and whom accordingly they do not hesitate to baptize earlier than is the custom in other missions dealing only with the free. Special instruction such as is necessary thus comes *after* baptism, and it is generally the bare minimum. Admission to the other great Sacrament is also granted on what seem to be easier terms than those which other missions impose, and on the whole the Roman methods lie open to the charge of attaching excessive importance to the external rites, while the other missions, including the Anglican, may perhaps be said to have too little trust in the inward gifts of grace.

We come now to the mission of the United Free Church, which is at once the earliest in the Nyasa field—except for the abortive attempt of the Universities' Mission in 1861—and also the one claiming the largest visible results. Its sphere is the western side of the lake, and at the present time not the whole of that side, but rather the northern part of it. The southern half, in which this mission first settled, has for some years been handed over by a mutual agreement to the mission of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa, but a real link is kept up between the two societies by allowing members from one society a seat on the Mission Council of the other. From the first this mission, commonly called Livingstonia because it was a memorial to Livingstone, has been of the class which Dr. Stewart calls the 'Combined Mission'—that is to say, in Dr.

Stewart's own words, it is at once 'evangelistic, educational, industrial, medical.' The first party included ordained evangelists, trained teachers, artisans, and a doctor. From the first the aim has been to civilize as well as Christianize. The Christianizing has always come first in each department of work, but this mission has always held it its duty to train its converts either as teachers or in some useful trade, such as printing, telegraphy, clerks' work, bricklaying, &c. The clerks and artisans so trained have been useful in many places outside the mission itself in this rapidly developing country, while the teachers have been used far and wide in the sphere of the mission as evangelists and teachers where the European would make small progress.

The mission has had a not uneventful history, and was concerned with the African Lakes Company in the beginnings of the war which secured to British Central Africa freedom at last from the threatening Arab slave trader. A great work has been done among the Ngoni, who were formerly the terror of the weaker lake-side tribes, and who are now perfectly quiet, peaceful inhabitants of their land, and are in request all over the Protectorate and right away down to the Rand as porters and *machila*¹ carriers and unskilled labourers wherever the white man has set up his stations for trade or other work. The Livingstonia people have borne a large share in civilizing and converting these warlike tribes, and their work has been backed by, and in its turn has been very useful to, the Administration in their settlement of the country. One sometimes hears it said that the missionaries are a thorn in the side of the administrator. We hope they are, if the administrator is doing wrong or dealing unwisely, but we have never heard that the missions of Nyasaland did anything but forward the work of settlement, and the pages of Sir Harry Johnston's book on the country contain warm praise and high appreciation of their work. The Livingstonia mission, which lies in the direct path of the administrator, is to be

¹ The *machila* is a hammock slung on a stout pole and carried by a gang of natives in relays of two or four each. It is the usual conveyance for the European who cannot walk, and for longer journeys inland away from rivers and railways.

congratulated on gaining his friendly expressions of feeling. The progress made was, as it should be, slow at first, and is now becoming rapid. Six years were spent in laying the foundations before the missionaries baptized their first convert. Now the number of communicants in this one mission is reckoned at nearly 2,400, and the number of scholars, young and old, in the schools is reckoned at nearly 20,000. This is remarkable progress, and Dr. Stewart says that the Uganda Mission is the only other in Africa which offers a parallel. We can say from personal experience that there is certainly no other in British Central Africa which claims anything like such astounding results. Dr. Laws, who has been the leader of the mission ever since 1875, writes in his account of the mission as follows: 'The day of waiting for open doors for work has been replaced by so many opportunities for it that the missionaries at all the stations are burdened with the impossibility of seizing these as they present themselves.' These 'open doors' are one of the secrets of this marvellous expansion, but the Livingstonia Mission has helped so much, under God, in opening these doors and in making use of them that every friend of missions must rejoice with its leaders in the harvest that they are being allowed to reap.

The present writer has not had the opportunity of seeing the work of this mission in the field, and he can only say that the experience and observation of other neighbouring fields, together with what he hears from old missionaries all around, lead him to temper this glowing account of progress with a touch of fear lest the progress should have been allowed to become *too* rapid, and to jeopardize the permanency of the results. It is easy to tell whether a native is a good book-keeper or an expert carpenter, but it is very easy, also, to be deceived about the hidden changes of the heart. The printed reports of this mission seem so free from the darker shades appearing as a rule in other reports that one is impelled to ask if these good men are perchance deceiving themselves. It must be remembered that the British domination of the country has given the native a great inducement to adopt the white man's ideas in things unseen as well as in things seen, and there is

need in such circumstances for the greatest caution. The time of peril for the Christian Church began not with the era of persecutions, but with the cessation of persecution, and it is the same to-day. The African is not one of those dying races which falls before the white man, but a race whose sons are quick to assimilate so far as they can the new ways and the new things which the white man brings. And Livingstonia has dazzled them from the first. The first party came into the lake on the first steamer which ever navigated any of the great inland waterways of Africa. And, lately, it was Livingstonia which first set up a plant for electric light and power at its great training Institute for teachers and every kind of skilled workmen. It is Livingstonia which first shews the African the wonder of a water supply drawn from miles away and supplied to the station in steel pipes. All these things are not without their bearing on the evangelistic work, and, we repeat, they do not necessarily help that work, while they do complicate the task of judging whether progress is really evangelistic progress or otherwise. It is the danger to which the Combined Mission is especially liable, and it takes us back to the fundamental question of how far it may be best or right for the missionary to combine his proper function with all these others. We shall return to this point again further on. It should be added here that the medical work of Livingstonia has progressed at least as fast as all its other work, and that, as might be expected and as we find in most pioneer missions, it was the first work to make progress at all. The cost of the Livingstonia Mission is reckoned by Dr. Stewart at not less than 8,000*l.* a year, and, he adds, this estimate takes no account of the twenty-four people who have spent not money but their lives in the work.

As we have already seen, the United Free Church was followed to the Central African field within a year by the mission, conveniently known as the Blantyre Mission, sent from the Established Church of Scotland. This mission settled in the Shiré highlands and began work on very much the same lines as the one just described—that is, like the Livingstonia Mission, it is one of the ‘combined’ kind. But there have been considerable differences in the methods of the

congratulated on gaining his friendly expressions of feeling. The progress made was, as it should be, slow at first, and is now becoming rapid. Six years were spent in laying the foundations before the missionaries baptized their first convert. Now the number of communicants in this one mission is reckoned at nearly 2,400, and the number of scholars, young and old, in the schools is reckoned at nearly 20,000. This is remarkable progress, and Dr. Stewart says that the Uganda Mission is the only other in Africa which offers a parallel. We can say from personal experience that there is certainly no other in British Central Africa which claims anything like such astounding results. Dr. Laws, who has been the leader of the mission ever since 1875, writes in his account of the mission as follows: 'The day of waiting for open doors for work has been replaced by so many opportunities for it that the missionaries at all the stations are burdened with the impossibility of seizing these as they present themselves.' These 'open doors' are one of the secrets of this marvellous expansion, but the Livingstonia Mission has helped so much, under God, in opening these doors and in making use of them that every friend of missions must rejoice with its leaders in the harvest that they are being allowed to reap.

The present writer has not had the opportunity of seeing the work of this mission in the field, and he can only say that the experience and observation of other neighbouring fields, together with what he hears from old missionaries all around, lead him to temper this glowing account of progress with a touch of fear lest the progress should have been allowed to become *too* rapid, and to jeopardize the permanency of the results. It is easy to tell whether a native is a good book-keeper or an expert carpenter, but it is very easy, also, to be deceived about the hidden changes of the heart. The printed reports of this mission seem so free from the darker shades appearing as a rule in other reports that one is impelled to ask if these good men are perchance deceiving themselves. It must be remembered that the British domination of the country has given the native a great inducement to adopt the white man's ideas in things unseen as well as in things seen, and there is

need in such circumstances for the greatest caution. The time of peril for the Christian Church began not with the era of persecutions, but with the cessation of persecution, and it is the same to-day. The African is not one of those dying races which falls before the white man, but a race whose sons are quick to assimilate so far as they can the new ways and the new things which the white man brings. And Livingstonia has dazzled them from the first. The first party came into the lake on the first steamer which ever navigated any of the great inland waterways of Africa. And, lately, it was Livingstonia which first set up a plant for electric light and power at its great training Institute for teachers and every kind of skilled workmen. It is Livingstonia which first shews the African the wonder of a water supply drawn from miles away and supplied to the station in steel pipes. All these things are not without their bearing on the evangelistic work, and, we repeat, they do not necessarily help that work, while they do complicate the task of judging whether progress is really evangelistic progress or otherwise. It is the danger to which the Combined Mission is especially liable, and it takes us back to the fundamental question of how far it may be best or right for the missionary to combine his proper function with all these others. We shall return to this point again further on. It should be added here that the medical work of Livingstonia has progressed at least as fast as all its other work, and that, as might be expected and as we find in most pioneer missions, it was the first work to make progress at all. The cost of the Livingstonia Mission is reckoned by Dr. Stewart at not less than 8,000*l.* a year, and, he adds, this estimate takes no account of the twenty-four people who have spent not money but their lives in the work.

As we have already seen, the United Free Church was followed to the Central African field within a year by the mission, conveniently known as the Blantyre Mission, sent from the Established Church of Scotland. This mission settled in the Shiré highlands and began work on very much the same lines as the one just described—that is, like the Livingstonia Mission, it is one of the ‘combined’ kind. But there have been considerable differences in the methods of the

work. The Livingstonia Mission belongs rather to the class of 'Diffused' Missions, but is so far free from the excesses of that type that we did not classify it as such in our summary of its work. So far as it has gone on that track, just so far has the Blantyre Mission not followed its steps. The Blantyre Mission, in fact, may be taken as standing in Central Africa for the model of the Concentrated Mission in all respects, but some allowance in comparison of these two Presbyterian missions must be made for the difference in the scale of the work. We will not compare them on a head-counting basis, because no basis could be more fallacious, but by looking to the number of stations—that is, of distinct centres of work. We find that Blantyre has only twelve stations, as against 234 stations claimed by Livingstonia. Of this large number of Livingstonia stations no fewer than 226 are described as out-stations, and are only under the supervision of an itinerating European from one or other of the eight main stations.

These figures illustrate more clearly than any words can do our statement that to some extent the Livingstonia Mission is of the type of the 'Diffused' Mission. At Blantyre the aim from the first has been the building up of one strong centre, and the development away from that centre has been rather incidental and inevitable than planned and deliberate. Some of it is that healthiest of all extension work, the missionary effort not of the Church of Scotland but of the native Church of Blantyre. Some of it is necessary development following the growth of new British settlements in the Shire highlands. At Blantyre we find, as at the Livingstonia Institute, that the double work of civilizing and Christianizing has gone on hand in hand, though here as there the evangelistic work is the first consideration and has been the main-spring of the whole. Blantyre has built for its work what is still the finest Central African church, an ornate structure in red brick with a dome and bells, not very large, but so frequently filled, now with a white, now with a black, and again it may be with a black and white congregation, that it manages to fulfil its duty admirably. It is, as we have indicated, at once the church of the Native Blantyre Presbyterian body and also the church of the white residents, and

provision is made for service on Sunday at least in both the vernacular and the English language.

The work of Blantyre comes under four heads, evangelical, medical, educational, and industrial. In each of these four departments the methods have been slow and sure, and the visible results are calculated to make a deep impression upon the visitor. Lying as it does on the highway from the outer world to inner Central Africa, to the Nyasa country, and to the Tanganyika and Congo country, there are a great many people passing through Blantyre in the year, and everyone pays a visit to the mission station, to which the name Blantyre was originally confined. The number of communicant members of the Native Church is about 700, counting together all the main stations ; but the figures do not represent—as indeed one never expects figures to do—the depth as well as the extent of the work that has been accomplished. There are excellent hospitals, with wards both for Europeans and for natives, and the appreciation of this work among the white residents of Blantyre may be gauged by the fact that the various traders and trading companies there make annual contributions to the native hospitals, and retain for their employés beds in case of need.

The schools of Blantyre are of the very best kind, but they do not aim at the same magnificence of equipment as we have noticed in the Livingstonia Schools and Institute. There are practically two grades of schools, known as the Vernacular Schools and the Anglo-vernacular, names which explain themselves and which correspond more or less to the names Out Schools and Central Schools, which we find in use in the Universities' Mission. The scholars at Blantyre School are boarders, and their life while they remain in the hands of the mission is carefully ordered for them, so that they get a training in such manual work as they may be fitted for as well as in the ordinary rudiments of education. They rise and come and go to the bugle call or the church bell, and the aim is to provide occupation for each hour as it passes, and to instil such an instinct for work and respect for it as shall be a shield to them in their after-life. All those who are capable are encouraged to go on to some

skilled trade, and there are beautiful shops for the carpenters and printers, a well-appointed office for those who wish to be trained as clerks, the hospitals and dispensaries with skilled doctors and nurses in charge for those who take to medicine, and last, but not least, a large garden which gives ample room for a thorough training in the best agriculture and horticulture. The industrial departments at Blantyre, as also, we believe, at Livingstonia, are each under the care of a skilled European director. The gardening and carpentry and printing are not amateur, but of the very best, and in the matter of gardening in particular the Blantyre people have nothing to learn from anyone.

The mission does not commit the error of aiming at being self-supporting, but it claims that incidentally its industrial departments do practically pay for themselves. Provision is made for the juniors by giving them daily tasks of the unskilled kind about the station. No boy or girl is allowed to eat the bread of idleness, and so at the end of the three years which are considered enough for the junior course, and enough for the boy who has no call to higher work, each boy has to choose whether he will be a teacher, printer, carpenter, clerk, dispensary boy, or agriculturist, or whether he will leave the mission and return to his village, slightly educated, perhaps a Church member, to live the ordinary village life of his tribe. It should be noticed, by the way, that the children sent to the school may be Christian already, since the missionaries have now reached after twenty years' work the second generation, and may have anywhere in Central Africa to deal with the children of the first converts; or they may be still outsiders, and it is noticeable at Blantyre that even the teachers in the schools are not always or necessarily Christian, though, of course, they are at least under instruction for baptism. And here it may not be out of place to point out that in the missions of all these bodies the same care, with certain differences, is exercised in the admission of natives to baptism. There are, so far as we know, no missionary bodies working in Nyasaland who quite follow St. Francis Xavier in his trust in holy baptism, as saving men whether they would or no, simply *ex opere operato*,

though the Romans may appear to approximate. Nor are there any missionaries whose idea is to stand in the middle of a heathen village proclaiming the name of their Master, and then immediately admitting to the ranks of the elect such persons as are too polite to disappoint an obviously earnest man. Matters of this kind are naturally delicate points on which to converse with the agents of another Church than one's own, and hence the present writer can only record his personal impression that the Blantyre Mission, like the Anglican one, is obliged to be content with what are more or less mechanical tests for their converts, such as attendance at classes, the absorption of a certain amount of teaching, and the external sign of a life freed from the heathen practices to which they were born, and conformed in externals to the Christian rule of conduct. Much as we should all like to see into the hearts of our converts, that is a privilege which God has no doubt happily denied even to the wisest of us, and so the less excellent, but only possible tests have to be used by all.

We have only mentioned the special departments for boys at Blantyre, but there are also similar and suitable ones for the girls; and this is necessary not only as a means of raising woman from the low position in which native society leaves her, but also that the boys who are growing up may be able to choose for themselves Christian wives, and set up in the heart of heathen Africa that divinest of all institutions, the Christian home, a more powerful instrument for good than any other which the wit of man can by any means devise. The Blantyre Mission has enjoyed to an even greater extent than Livingstonia the advantage of working under the shield of a growing British power in the country, but as we have ventured to indicate above, this may be a doubtful boon. That is to say, it is more and more difficult as the white man's power increases in the land to separate the good which is being done in men's hearts by the teaching of Christ, directly or indirectly, from a mere external following of the ways of the white man. And the attraction to the external observance of an easy form of the white man's faith, bringing as it does emancipation from the old sanctions

without perhaps binding the emancipated one firmly with fresh bonds of the new religious sanctions, is so strong that great caution must be needed in the testing of candidates.

We have spoken of the indirect Christian influence of the white population, and we have no doubt that it exists and is an excellent thing. But we are equally certain that the presence of the white man not infrequently brings into play influences altogether evil and anti-Christian as well as immoral. This is a subject that does not need to be dilated upon, but we must be permitted to quote Dr. Hetherwick of Blantyre, who knows both the native and the white man who comes into the country as few men in Nyasaland can do. He says :

‘The temptations of life around Blantyre are many and strong. The growing wealth of the people has opened a wide door to uncontrolled self-indulgence ; and sins which old native poverty would have repressed, readily find room in hearts little bound by ties of self-restraint. Certainly the Church’s life is tested in no sheltered garden, but exposed to every storm of licence on the treacherous shore where heathenism and civilization meet.’

The Blantyre Mission more than any other in Nyasaland has had to stand on this treacherous shore. It is a matter for great thanksgiving that the mission policy has been so long in the hands of men whose eyes are open to the danger, and whose wisdom has dictated the slow and, we trust, sure method which the Blantyre Mission has followed with deserved success. If one word of friendly criticism may be permitted, we would suggest the fear that the Blantyre Mission may be open to the charge which has been made against the Moravians already—namely, that there may be a little too much reliance placed on European supervision, and not enough on the unfettered grace of God working in the heart.

In a future article we propose to review the work of the Anglican Mission, together with such general considerations as may suggest themselves.

ART. III.—CHURCH MUSIC.

1. *Report on Church Music, by a Committee of Worcester Diocesan Conference, 1904*: with papers contributed by Members.
2. *Church Music*. By A. MADELEY RICHARDSON, M.A., Mus. Doc., F.R.C.O., Organist and Director of the Choir of St. Saviour's Collegiate Church. 'Handbooks for the Clergy' Series. (London: Longmans, 1904.)
3. *The Southwark Psalter*. The words arranged in paragraphs by BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., late Bishop of Durham, sometime Canon of Peterborough; and set to music by A. MADELEY RICHARDSON. (London: Longmans, 1905.)

THERE are few subjects so conspicuously provocative of discord as the question of music in church. It is assumed on all sides that there ought to be music, but the question of the proper kind and amount of it seems to be almost hopeless to determine. Persons, ordinarily of placid temperament, who can bear opposition even in politics with equanimity, become furious partisans when Church Music comes under discussion. The most meek and hesitating people in other matters are apt to become loudly dogmatic in this, and the whole discussion is noisy and irritable. It is, perhaps, a rash act to enter upon a subject which leads to so much difference of opinion. We think, however, that its importance and interest justify this rashness, and we will endeavour for our part to deal peacefully with opinions which we do not share.

We shall be in a better position for expressing a view as to the immediate questions of the day in these matters, if we recall first some more general considerations as to the position of music in church. The divergences of view which are so marked in the present have, as a rule, their origin in the past—though this is not always known to the disputants—and one of the reasons why the debate tends to become acrid is because each party sees in his own convictions matters of principle which the other party seems to be treating frivolously

or inconsiderately, and thus a sense of personal affront is added to a difference of opinion.

The first point to which we propose to call attention is one which seems to us to have been most curiously neglected. It is surely remarkable that writers on our present subject so rarely notice the very exceptional position which music holds in regard to religion. Some form of architecture is necessary, no doubt, if buildings are to be erected for purposes of worship. It is easy to understand the religious use of the art of painting. These arts hold in regard to religion much the same position which they hold in secular life. Religious architecture and religious painting are simply varieties of the ordinary art; they perform for religion the same kind of functions which they perform for ordinary life. But the case is not quite the same with music. If one asks the ordinary man, who accepts what is in existence without much thought, why prayer and worship should be associated with music, he usually says that we are bound to give of our best for the service of the sanctuary. The answer is both beautiful and true, but it conceals the fact that it is mainly in connexion with religion that musical treatment seems to be so obviously better than the spoken word. We call in an architect, for instance, the best we have, to design a house for a king; but there is no address to the King, however solemn, which has to be intoned; even the Debate on the Address is conducted without musical accompaniment. It is true, we have Opera; but it is only our familiarity with that form of art which conceals the real difficulty which it suggests of combining music with ordinary life. Wagner's most elaborate devices do not make it natural to supersede the speaking voice by song. In short, it is only religion to which music comes as the natural means of self-expression. Outside religion music is an art, which may be pursued or not; within this limit, it seems to be almost necessary. We can imagine any part of life vacant of music except religion; here it has a natural home.

It is probable that psychologists would easily produce a reason for this affinity. Religion deals, in its basal forms, with the half-articulate sense of a Divine Presence in the

world, especially in strange mysterious surroundings, and in objects which are out of the common, and look as if they had a history. Music in like manner interprets those 'mysterious motions of the soul, nowise to be defined, save in strange melodies.' Religion in its early stages is too certainly intuitive for articulation; and music deals with emotions in general rather than in particular; it expresses love or devotion rather than the merits of a particular eyebrow, or the thoughts appropriate, say, to the Invention of the Holy Cross. Because of this essential vagueness and generality in which it resembles religion, and because of its extraordinarily moving power, it has accompanied religion throughout. Any other part of life may be complete without music, but not religion.

At the same time, music is an art which has its own independent history and canons. It develops on its own lines, and those who follow it seriously must use the musical language of their own age and country. A musical composition which has any real meaning is not like an edition of a classic, in the preface of which the author acknowledges indebtedness to various writers who have preceded him, and hopes that he may, in some degree, have advanced the study of the subject: it is a new creation; historians may be able to say how an old form has been modified and improved; but the composition must speak for itself. It speaks, of course, to minds which have reached or nearly reached the stage of musical development of the composer; but it has its effect as a whole and as it stands. A symphony of Beethoven would be a mere babel of sounds to a person whose notion of music included only howling over a bass of tom-tom, or the ordinary music-hall song. The hearer must understand or be able to catch the principles and devices of the composer, and the composer must always write for the highest level of intelligence which he can imagine. Music grows by means of an increasingly sympathetic relation between the composer and the hearer. The composer can count upon increasing quickness and intelligence, the hearer is readier to understand and interpret his hints; and so forms of music which at one period of man's history would have

been regarded as mere noise appear at another as the perfection of art.

Now this means, in the first place, that music has a history and development of its own, of which its use as an interpreter of religious emotion is only a part; and secondly, that the connexion of the art with religious worship must always involve something of a compromise. Most of the real problems connected with music in church arise, we are convinced, over the terms of this compromise. Each party to it, the artist and the worshipper, is inclined to complain that he fails of his just rights. The compromise, moreover, is not even a simple one in itself. On the one hand, there is the necessary compromise between the purely artistic and the religious aims; and on the other, there is the compromise between the rights of musical and of unmusical worshippers. Both involve very difficult negotiations; but we think that the second is far the more difficult of the two. We will consider first the relation between the artistic and the religious aim.

We have already referred to the fact that music has had a considerable history of its own, and that in the process the relation between the composer and the hearer has become more intimate and complex. It would be far from the purpose of the present article to discuss the ultimate aim or purpose of the art, but we may say without argument that at all periods of its history it has aimed at expressing emotion of various kinds. Wherever it has achieved its object it has done at least that; and this may be said of it as well in the time of Plato as in the time of Wagner or Richard Strauss. The method and the means differ, but the object is the same. As we look back upon the means at Plato's disposal, and the methods employed in his day, it is with the utmost difficulty that we can conceive any pleasure or pleasurable emotion resulting from the performance. But Plato was not of this opinion. He thought the music of his day too dangerously expressive, and wished to restrict its operations to the expression of two emotional conditions only. The brave good man in war and peace was to be the sole subject permitted to musical interpretation. In making his selection of permissible modes in the moral interest of the guardians

of his State Plato exercised a selective judgement upon the art as it stood in his day ; he allowed some modes of musical expression and rejected others. He did not deny that the others were musically attractive and artistic, but he held that their moral tendency was unfortunate. In like manner the Church, when it began to formulate the principles of ecclesiastical music, dealt with an art already in existence. It therefore took over from the art as pursued in secular circles the modes to which association has given a peculiarly ecclesiastical ring. But it did so because they expressed emotion in what then seemed an obviously and naturally intelligible way—the difference between religious and secular music being marked by a greater simplicity in the tunes, not by a difference of scale or mode.¹ Everyone who wished to think or express himself musically thought and sang in these modes ; if he wished to give musical expression to his religious feelings he adapted the time and rhythm of his tune to them, but he did not think it necessary to devise a wholly new scale. In other words, religious music at the beginning meant the use for religious purposes of musical methods already recognized as artistic and expressive.

Mr. Woolridge points out further² that the necessities of ecclesiastical worship gave the impetus to that new development in music which took shape in the great polyphonic school, culminating in Palestrina. But the art did not stand still. On the secular side it changed by degrees until it reached its modern shape ; the older methods ceased to speak directly to men's ears ; newer and more complex possibilities were opened ; the art grew, and still religion could use its methods in its own way. Religion is, or ought to be, as much at home with a modern orchestra and chorus as it was with the Græco-Italian modes which were in vogue in the fourth century. This modern machinery will express much else besides religious emotion, but there is nothing in it essentially irreligious, nor anything essentially religious in the more archaic scales.

These facts, though true and obvious, are important to

¹ *Oxford History of Music*, vol. i., by H. E. Woolridge, ch. iii.

² *Op. cit.* pp. 42 ff.

remember when we are considering the principles of religious music, because it is often assumed that there is something peculiarly authoritative about the ancient ecclesiastical modes, and something incompatible with religious self-expression in modern music. Thus Mr. Brightman, in a review of the admirable Handbook on Church Music by Dr. Richardson—the organist of Southwark Cathedral—quarrels with Dr. Richardson for speaking of Plainsong as belonging to a by-gone age.¹ Mr. Brightman candidly disclaims any technical knowledge of music, and he does well to do so, for his position is not that of a musician but of an ecclesiastical antiquary. When the ecclesiastical modes were adopted by the Church, they expressed, as the famous passage in St. Augustine's *Confessions* clearly shews, the musical instincts of the people of their day. St. Augustine's fear was that they were only too sensuous for their purpose.² They are obsolete now in the same sense as Latin is a dead language; no musician thinks naturally in these modes, any more than anyone speaks or prays naturally now in Latin. People can train their ears to delight in them, just as long discipline may enable scholars to write Latin; but from the musical point of view this does not alter their relation to the art; they belong to 'a bygone age.' It may be a consolation to Mr. Brightman to know that, in our opinion, he errs in company with the present Pope. It is perhaps necessary to restrain the vagaries of musicians in Roman churches, and the Pope has probably done well to interfere; but we cannot regard the restriction of music in church to certain ancient patterns as anything but an uncertain expedient which must prove futile.

So far we have spoken from the point of view of the art itself. But we think that our position is no less sound from the point of view of Church policy; and this in two directions. Since the date of the Reformation there has been a serious divorce between religion and art, with the one considerable exception of music. Painting has become mainly secular; the Guild of Artists being an endeavour to regain some hold on that aspect of life. Religious poetry has been almost

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. vi. no. 22. p. 313.

² *Aug. Conf. Lib. x. c. 33.*

entirely in the hands of minor poets ; but religious music has attracted the energies of the greatest of all masters of the art, men to whom the advance of music itself has owed the greatest debts in the last two hundred years. It needs little reflection to see that any attempts to confine ecclesiastical music within any bounds of method, arbitrarily selected out of the past history of the art, destroys the connexion for ever. If the Church is to use, as it has always done, the services of the greatest musicians of the day, it cannot claim to dictate to them how they are to express themselves musically. The unreasoning devotion to Handel which governed Crotch, the similar devotion to the old Church school which governed Ouseley, was, it is not too much to say, the artistic ruin of those composers. For the most part, we have passed beyond this position at the present time, and it would be recognized as patently absurd to expect Parry, or Stanford, or Lloyd, or Elgar, or Walford Davies, or Coleridge Taylor, or Harwood to write in any other musical language than their own. If they write religious music they will write religiously, using the modern resources of the art in their own way, and with the skill that they have ; and all criticism based upon the canons and methods of past stages of the art will be entirely beside the mark.

Further, the limitation of Church music to modes of the art which no longer speak directly to modern ears seems to us impolitic for another reason. The use of music in church is one very important way in which the attention and interest of men is excited. It will surely cast an additional and irrelevant burden upon the clergy, and an additional obstacle in the way of those who come to church, if we require of them to tune their ears to an unwonted style of music as well as their souls and consciences to an unaccustomed message. The parson will inevitably tend to provide the music which his experience shews him will prove attractive ; the people will inevitably tend to go where they will hear what they understand ; both will tend to be indifferent to the claims of antiquarianism, and, in some cases, even to the canons of art. This is, perhaps, a matter of regret, but it is a position which no regrets can alter. However close the connexion between music and

religion, the practical question of religious efficiency will always take precedence of all others in the minds of clergy and people.

And here a question will arise. How far, we may ask, is the Church justified in permitting a type of music which is artistically poor? Its music must, we insist, be modern, or at least must not exclude the modern; is there any justification for intrinsically poor and mean music? This is, we think, the point at which the compromise necessarily involved in the use of music in Church worship is likely to prove the most serious strain upon the artistic conscience. It seems to us that a great deal in this case depends upon the purpose to which the music is applied. There are parts of the service in which the Church, as it were, speaks in its corporate capacity. The words are prescribed in the Prayer Book, and there is no licence for individual expression. We may fairly expect that here the music, however popular and simple, will be restrained and artistic. It has to carry with it more than the expression of shifting individual feeling, and no one can complain if, like the words, the music goes beyond the power of the individual imagination and expression. It would not be difficult, we think, to find music which would be worth singing, and at the same time be fairly direct and intelligible. Hints on the subject may be found in Dr. Richardson's Manual. But the matter assumes a different complexion when we come to deal with hymns, and services which lie outside the prescribed order of the Church. In this case we have to deal not so much with the formal expression of religious emotion, as with the feelings of a body of people who do not necessarily feel in themselves the sentiment of the Church at all, or realize themselves as a unity. As the preacher appeals to various emotions of hope and fear and love and the like, and must do so if he is to win souls, so the music attached to all this individual side of worship must be less restrained than the ecclesiastical type. And again, as the style of the preacher will have to suit itself in some degree to the audience if the preaching is to be effective, so also must the style of the music. As phrases and appeals which would be absurdly out of place in a University pulpit are natural and reasonable

enough in a parish church, as a style that would give offence in a West-end church might be exactly the right one for the East of London, so with hymns. They belong rather to the preaching function of the Church than to that of formal worship, and they must naturally have the latitude of expression which belongs to the preacher. It will be possible, no doubt, for the clergyman, with the help of his organist, to secure for the emotions of the people the best musical expression that is consistent with their level of understanding; and there will be limits of vulgarity which no one should transgress. But these will have to be drawn rather widely. The first duty of the Church is to the spiritual, not the æsthetic side of men: and it would be mere pedantry to insist that the musical language of the Church should be one not understood of the people.

It is said, of course, that bad tunes have a definitely bad and demoralizing effect upon those who use them. There is considerable truth in this. We should be the last to deny the reality of the effect of music upon the moral nature, or to treat it as a meaningless adjunct to words. But here again it is possible to be pedantic. Uneducated persons express themselves, when they are moved, in language which grates upon the sensitiveness of polished people. How often we hear it said, for instance, that the poor are heartless in speaking of the dead. Yet everyone who knows them well knows that this is an outrageous misrepresentation, based upon a lack of intelligence of their language. They speak directly and without reserve where reticence seems better to people in a different condition of culture; and it is a complete mistake to suppose that their phrases are, relatively to them, unfeeling or vulgar. It is the same with music. A mode of expression which training and reflection will reject as coarse and exaggerated may be sincere and true to other minds, and we should be wrong in applying to it canons of taste and criticism which have never dawned upon the minds of those who use it. Moreover, there is especial need for care in dealing with musical expression, since the lines of cleavage between stages of musical culture by no means correspond with the division of the classes. It would be easy to find in

the ranks of the 'cultured classes' crowds of individuals whose sincere musical ideas are exhausted within the limits of the music-hall ditty; and it may perhaps, therefore, be necessary to countenance in 'fashionable' churches music which is artistically on a level with the corybantic enthusiasm of the street-preacher, in the sheer interest of the spiritual development of the congregation. They, like other people, must have in the individual parts of the Church service the musical expression which they understand. The artist will have to hear—perhaps, if he be organist, to accompany—many distressing compositions; it is the sacrifice which his membership of the Church requires of him.

We have now considered, briefly enough, some of the difficulties which arise over the necessary compromise between the canons of art and the requirements of Church order. We contend that no one style can rightly be selected as exclusively appropriate to religious uses, and that the attempt to do so implies an unhistorical view of the actual relations which have existed between the Church and the art of music. Also, we maintain that the canons of right and wrong in art require a somewhat liberal construction if they are to work satisfactorily in the practical experience of Church life. We must now pass on to the other series of questions raised by the use of music in the Church. This touches the relation of the musical to the unmusical members of the congregation. We may safely say in regard to this that if it could be safely adjusted a large part of the worries of a parish priest would cease to exist in many parishes.

It seems to us to be of the highest importance in connexion with this group of problems to begin by making a fundamental distinction between cathedral and parochial churches. A cathedral, like St. Paul's, will provide services at certain times and seasons of a popular kind, and in these, probably, the principles applying to parochial churches will hold sway. But the loose relation of the cathedral clergy to the congregation, and the fact that there is, in all the older cathedrals, a musical establishment, relieve the cathedral church of the duty of considering so carefully the limits and prejudices of the unmusical. If ecclesiastical music is to be a real force anywhere,

it must be strongly fostered and protected in the cathedrals; and there it should be possible to hear the best music of all periods. The main source upon which the precentor will draw for anthems and services will, of course, be the English compositions designed for this special use. But we think a wise precentor will distinguish the good from the bad within the limits of this school. There were bad composers and poor compositions as well as good ones in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and it is kinder to leave them alone on their shelves than to lay bare their futility by performance. The danger is, however, not to be sought in this direction as a rule, but in the tendency to omit everything which does not appeal instantaneously to modern ears. On the other hand, it would seem to us pedantic to exclude on grounds of principle all compositions not originally written for cathedral use. It is always a matter of surprise to us that so little attention is given to Bach's Church cantatas. Yet there is magnificent music in them, and they were composed for the various Sundays and Holy-days in the Christian year. The words, it is true, frequently verge on absurdity, but this is, we think, a difficulty which might be surmounted. In short, we hold that the music of a cathedral church may rightly be expected to draw from all available sources, both English and foreign, and thus to set a pattern for a whole district and diocese of what Church music may and ought to be. Such services will not be 'congregational': that is, a member of the congregation who, in intrepid individualism, adventures himself in the music will almost inevitably meet with disaster, and will cause dismay to all who hear him. Unmusical canons whose function it is to attend upon the services will groan inwardly and plead for brevity. But the general result will not be loss. A high type of cathedral music has a purifying and elevating effect both in itself and by reason of its associations; it is difficult to estimate adequately the loss to the Church if the daily cathedral services were suddenly to be stopped. Would the religion of London be improved if the choir of S. Paul's were silenced or their duty reduced to the performance of 'hearty congregational hymns'? We think not.

It is probable that these views so far as regards cathedral

music would meet with very wide acceptance even among those who groan when the service or anthem appears to them tedious. The difficulty begins when we come to consider the music in parish churches. There are several elements of perplexity in this matter. It is said sometimes that the trouble which the musical side of a parochial church produces is greater than any advantages that may be derived from it, and that it would really be better to try to get along without any choir, and so have real congregational singing. It seems to us that this is simply a counsel of despair, and that, even if it were practicable, it would be adopted only at a very great sacrifice. From the point of view of the best interests of the parish, we are sure that a well-managed and well-trained choir is of the highest value. It is true that the temptation of such a choir is to regard the music as the superior interest in the Church; but this is a temptation from which a well-trained choir, especially if, as Dr. Richardson points out, it is a paid choir, can very largely be kept. On the other hand the choir may form a most valuable nucleus of loyal helpers for the parson: they will be interested and loyal just because they have work to do for the Church. Choir-boys are sometimes supposed to be the most diabolical of their eccentric race: but we are convinced that, where this is the case, it is mainly due to neglect or mismanagement. Boys, like men, understand and value the fact of contributing service to the work of the Church; and though, if they are left to themselves, their necessary familiarity with sacred things may lead to contempt, we believe that choir-boys, well trained and kindly treated, will grow into loyal and intelligent churchmen. It would need a very great counterbalancing advantage to justify the extinction of the parochial choir.

But perhaps it will be said that the choir is on the whole a manageable problem: not so the organist. Here, it must be admitted, we approach perilous ground. But a word or two must be said, in spite of the delicacy of the subject. We are inclined to think, paradoxical as it may seem to some, that church organists are a much maligned race. Many of them have obvious faults. They are often more sensitive than they need be; some, whose natural gifts can hardly be said to

entitle them to the *pose*, adopt the erratic and incalculable manners of 'artists.' These things cannot be denied. But still, we maintain, they have much to suffer, and, on the whole, are wonderfully patient. In the first place, considering the work expected of them, they are probably the worst paid men in existence. This, of course, cannot altogether be helped; the funds in many parishes can only provide a very slender pittance for the organist; but it is a fact which has unfortunate consequences. It means as a rule that the organist is not properly a musician at all: he merely plays on Sunday and, perhaps, takes a weekly practice, as an amusement. Or he may be a professional musician, but with so small a salary that it is impossible to ask for or to expect much of his time beyond the barest minimum. Such arrangements may be better than nothing: but no one can be surprised if the choir fails to go smoothly in these conditions. The organist must be at home with the clergy and the choir if things are to go well: he will probably know little of either if he be merely an occasional visitor, whose work and main interests are elsewhere. These difficulties, as we have said, depend upon finance, and, as things are, seem insurmountable. But there are others which seem to us by no means insurmountable. Some of the friction which is heard of between the parson and organist might be avoided, we are convinced, by means of somewhat more intelligent sympathy on the part of the parson. It is hard, no doubt, for the absolutely unmusical man to take any real interest in the organist and his work or to treat him seriously. But we suspect that the most acute trouble arises between the organist and the semi-musical parson—the man who is, in music, an amateur at heart. By this we mean a man who is intolerant of everything except his own limited likings, who makes no effort to enlarge his musical intelligence, who praises and blames in the light of his own predilections merely, and never understands, nor tries to understand, the efforts or the ideals of the musician who works with him. He is the sort of man to miss the smaller effects which cost so much labour and make so much difference, like good phrasing; and to select occasions for praise when the music has been somewhat of a

trial to his organist's conscience; and he will do this not from sheer ignorance, which is invincible and must be forgiven, but from a careless, unintelligent half knowledge. Such people are not so uncommon as one could wish; and if friction arises between them and their organist the fault is not wholly to be put down to the undisciplined artistic temperament. Other people besides artists would find it 'get upon their nerves' to live with colleagues who talk with a sort of authority upon professional matters or whose praise and blame are alike bestowed wrongly.

But it is time to pass off this thorny ground. Let us suppose a parson in thorough sympathy with his choir and organist, and recognizing to the full the value of their services. What principles are to guide him in his dealings with the music? How can he best use their work for the general good of the whole congregation? The members of any congregation may, as a rule, be divided into three classes. There are persons who have no ear for music, and find no meaning in it. It is probable that at one time these formed the majority of almost any given congregation; but we hope and believe that the increasing interest in music, the improved position which it holds in almost all schools, and the greatly increased opportunities of hearing it, will reduce this class to a small minority of the whole nation. Then there will be persons who are really musical, who will wish to have the music as complete and good as possible; these also will probably be, in most cases, a minority. Lastly, there will be the semi-musical people, who have some ear and some knowledge, who could not endure a service without music at all, but are soon wearied; these will be the majority, and will be the hardest to please. These are the people who raise the whole question of congregational singing, for they labour under the conviction, as a rule, that they cannot 'take part in' any musical act of worship without personally contributing to the noise. In church, at any rate, a piece of music performed in their presence by others seems to lie outside them altogether; though we do not think they apply this principle to music performed elsewhere than in church. It cannot be denied that this class

of people is apt to be exacting ; we may have to admit also that their personal contributions to the music are sometimes extremely distressing to their neighbours, and are admirable rather for the spirit in which they are offered than for their æsthetic merits, or for the consequences to the devotion of others.¹

But they are there, and are probably the majority ; they must therefore be reckoned with. It goes without saying that the parson who deals fairly by his congregation will provide a suitable number of hymns in which all can join. We have already recommended that in the choice of these he will not press too hardly his canons of art, but make allowance for the needs of persons less advanced than he may be. We need not dwell further on the choice of hymns, except to commend a principle suggested in the Report of Bishop Gore's Committee on Church Music, (p. 16), viz. that one main object to be avoided is unreality of sentiment. This is undoubtedly true, but even here we are sure that it will be unwise to adopt too severe and ascetic an ideal : all the more as the number of hymns which can really be said to be good poetry is, we fear, rather a small one. We may assume, then, that there will be a sufficiency of defensible hymns. In regard to anthems also we are inclined to take the suggestions of the Worcester Committee. Long anthems poorly sung are, no doubt, beyond defence ; but we agree that 'where they are well sung' anthems 'are helpful and beautiful.' We would urge, however, that in this matter more exclusive obedience should be paid to the canons of art than is possible in regard to hymns. There are many short and comparatively easy anthems which are good music. There is no reason for singing any others. Each year large numbers are produced which lack point and distinction of every kind, but we can see no reason why they should ever be performed. They cannot do anyone any good, and they justly irritate everyone who looks for musical interest in this part of the service.

¹ The difficulty of those who must 'take part,' whether qualified by nature or otherwise, is a very old one. See Niceta of Remesiana, *De Bono Psalm.*, ed. Burn, c. 13, pp. 79-81.

Dr. Richardson, in his *Manual*, suggests a list of anthems which are really worth hearing; we strongly recommend that this or some such list should be taken as the basis of choice.

The anthem is the part of the service in which the choir alone performs; in the hymns, the choir at most leads the singing of the congregation. What are we to say of the other parts of the service—the prayers, psalms and canticles? It is clear that in all these the congregation is expected, as a rule, to have more than a silent part. In regard to the prayers we cordially approve the suggestion of Bishop Gore, that the speaking voice should be used more than has seemed ‘correct’ of late years. We do not think that this would be desirable in cathedrals, and it is true that ‘impressive reading’ is a serious danger. But, as is truly pointed out in the Worcester report, it has been a misfortune that the cathedral type of service has been introduced without modification into parish churches. It is often quite unsuitable, and, as performed, inflicts much unnecessary pain. There is no reason why the Confession should not be said, and the Lord’s Prayer and Creed either said or recited on ‘a low natural note.’¹

These are all questions of comparative simplicity; the real difficulty of the situation arises over the Canticles and Psalms. We agree with the Worcester Committee that it is undesirable to exclude altogether set services for the Canticles, and we admit that if these are very simple it is possible for the congregation to join in. But we should be disposed in parish churches to use them very sparingly, as their real principle is not congregational at all. Also we agree with the Committee that in many churches, especially village churches, the Psalms should be read. But if Psalms and Canticles are to be chanted, what system of chanting should be used? Here we come upon another hotly-contested question. For ourselves we frankly prefer the Anglican chant. We admit that its fixity of form renders it somewhat difficult to adapt to the changing lengths of the verses of the Psalms. We admit that its harmonies point to a balance between the

¹ *Worcester Report*, p. 22.

parts such as a congregation cannot attain. Also, we admit that there are many Anglican chants which are bad in various ways: some are unduly florid, some chromatic and sentimental, some have the recitation-note in an inconvenient place, and some are frankly hideous in every respect. But in spite of all this, the Anglican chant seems to us the most natural way of dealing with Psalms and Canticles when they are sung antiphonally. Many of the objections to these chants may be met by careful selection, and they have the advantage of being in the diatonic scale. Against this view is ranged that of those who for various reasons hold that the proper music for the Psalms, and, if chanted, for the Canticles, is the ancient plain-song of the Church. They have many arguments in their favour. The mere antiquity and ecclesiastical associations of the plain-chant appeal to some. Then the freedom of structure which belongs to the chants makes them suitable for the verses of the Psalms. Again it is urged in favour of them that they make less demand upon the ear so that the unmusical can join in them with less trouble than the Anglican chant requires. We should be sorry to see this venerable form of music disappear absolutely from the Church; but it seems to us to labour under very serious disadvantages. It is, we think, easier to get Anglican chants tolerably performed than the plain-song. An organist who adorns the tones with modern harmonies, or who is incapable of harmonizing them smoothly at all, is, in the present state of things, easier to find than one who treats them artistically. In other words, as things are, the chances are that they will be inadequately rendered. Further, we feel very strongly that they have no right to an exclusive predominance in the Church, while, at the same time, their structure and requirements make it very difficult for a choir to be equally at home in the old modes and in music of a modern type. They will be best in the hands of choirs which do nothing else, and this, we are convinced, is for most choirs the wrong policy.

A new method of treating the Psalms has recently been put forward by Dr. Richardson, the organist of Southwark Cathedral, whose Handbook on Church Music we have already

mentioned with approval. The *Southwark Psalter* is an heroic effort to deal with the subject in a way which will preserve all that is good in all the old traditions, and at the same time correspond more fully with modern ideas of the meaning and value of the Psalms. It is based on the Paragraph Psalter, issued by the late Bishop Westcott, in which the structure of the Hebrew Psalms is made plain in the English. Dr. Richardson has written chants for the whole Psalter. Triple and quadruple chants are provided for Psalms in which the verses are arranged as stanzas of three and four. Interludes are given to be played on the organ between the various sections of some Psalms, and to lead from the thoughts of one stanza or section to those of the next. The book bears traces on every page of the most careful thought and versatile ingenuity, and on this account deserves the highest praise. Probably we ought not to criticize it at all without having heard a complete month of the Psalms treated according to this book at Southwark. But we cannot wholly refrain from criticism, and we cannot conceal our conviction that the book is a splendid failure. For this we have several reasons. In the first place, this treatment of the Psalter absolutely extinguishes the congregation. No congregation could possibly follow the changes, allow for the pauses, and adapt itself to the variation of keys which this book requires. We gravely doubt whether these changes would be intelligible to most congregations even as merely *heard*, but we feel certain that the man who wishes to 'take part' would soon be reduced to a resentful silence. Next, the chants themselves seem, in many cases, extremely uninteresting. We doubt whether any man could write chants for the whole Psalter, and give to them all that character of the inevitable which a chant requires. To our minds, only a minority of the chants in this book have anything of the inevitable about them. The worst of all, in our opinion, are the triple and quadruple chants, for the exigencies of the situation require that parts of them shall be capable of omission, and this necessity seems to disorganize the whole composition. Some appear to be confused in tonality, and leave no impression on the mind. Others (e.g. Ps. 62 and 63) leave off in the key of the dominant with

a sense of weak ending. In some the recitation note is fixed upon a distant and complicated chord. Indeed, we have rarely seen chants which we wish less to live with.

It may be said, of course, that all this may be true, but is remediable. If the principle is accepted, some one else, or, more probably, a series of other musicians, will build chants according to Dr. Richardson's model which will realize his high ideal completely. That may be so. But we fear that we cannot accept the principle itself. It appears to us that, for congregational purposes, the Psalms do not call for this kind of treatment at all. They do not want an elaborate musical interpretation such as Dr. Richardson aims at providing. If the music is to express all the ideas of the Psalms it would have to be much longer and more elaborate than this. For music, on the whole, expresses positive ideas slowly and with some difficulty; it cannot shift about intelligibly at the pace of such quick and varied poems as the Psalms. Thus Dr. Richardson's 'interludes'—usually consisting of a bar or two of chords—seem to us to darken counsel. What is wanted for the congregational use of the Psalter is, in our opinion, a simple form of chant with comparatively little variety. Here, at least, the votaries of plain-song have an unanswerable case against such a method as Dr. Richardson's. They offer melodies which are scarcely more than a glorified method of reading, if we may so say, and the words are the predominant partner. The Psalms are recited, not set to music. Some points in their meaning will be lost, of course; it is impossible to illustrate in plain-chant (or in Anglican chanting) the technical structure of the Psalms; it will be left to the organist, if he be a capable man, to follow the changing moods of the Psalmist; and he will not be wise if he attempt too much in this way. But it appears to us that, for recitation in church, a severely restrained method like this is more to the point than the very elaborate process which Dr. Richardson offers in his Psalter. It is possible that, if we had had the advantage of a prolonged experience of the working of Dr. Richardson's method, something of what we have here said might be modified; but we cannot help feeling that he is on the wrong lines.

We have now considered very briefly some of the questions which arise in connexion with Church music, and suggested such solutions as appear to us practical. In a matter where there is so much divergence of taste, it is in the last degree unlikely that we shall carry conviction to all readers; we can expect no more than to have made plain what, to our minds, are the considerations involved in the question. In conclusion, we wish to add a few words on a point which lies outside our immediate subject, but which is closely relevant to it. One of the great difficulties, as it appears to us, in using music as an interpreter of the services of the Church is that the ideas and the words of the services themselves are insufficiently familiar. People who were brought up on the teaching of the Prayer Book, and who from earliest childhood were familiar with it as read in church and school and home, had a key to Church music which is no longer in the hands of a large number of people to-day owing to recent educational changes. Under the older Church training, people had a kind of presumption as to the object of the musician, as to the ideas and feelings which he was endeavouring to illustrate. Church music is always, unlike the great classical forms, allied with words, and it must be a great help towards the understanding of the music if the words, or at least the ideas which they embody, are present in the mind of the hearer. To take an instance: where organist and choir and hearer are really familiar with the Psalms, they will readily get into sympathy over the interpretation of them. The hearer may or may not feel bound to sing; however this may be, if he knows the Psalms well a very simple method of chanting and accompanying will serve to fix his attention, mark the points as they arise, and interpret the religious emotion that moves in them. The music will act as a commentary illustrating and clearing up the words. But to a man who is in the dark as to the ideas expressed in the service the music will be apt to appear confusing. In its subservience to the idea of the service, it sacrifices something of its own methods; it hints and outlines its meaning, rather than attempts to present in its own way a complete picture. And thus it is likely to

appear both tedious and scrappy, for the simple reason that it has not time, in its ancillary position, to develop its intentions in its own way. A great deal of the difficulty arising in connexion with music in church is due, we are sure, to a deficient appreciation of the Book to which the music is set; and we have little doubt that the ideal condition of Church music will be reached if and when some church is found where organist and choir, clergy and congregation are equally informed with the spirit of the Book of Common Prayer.

ART. IV.—THE EVIDENCE FOR THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

1. *Resurrection- and Ascension-Narratives.* By P. W. SCHMIEDEL, D.D. 'Encyclopædia Biblica,' vol. iv. cols. 4039-87. (London: A. and C. Black, 1903.)
2. *The Risen Master.* By H. LATHAM, M.A. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, 1900; revised edition, 1904.)
3. *What was the Lost End of S. Mark's Gospel?* By T. K. RÖRDAM, C.T., in *Hibbert Journal* for July 1905. (London: Williams and Norgate.)
4. *Our Lord's Resurrection.* By W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, M.A. 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.' (London: Longmans, 1905).
5. *The Life of Jesus.* By O. HOLTZMANN, D.D.; translated by J. T. BEALBY and M. A. CANNEY. (A. and C. Black, 1904.)

THE Resurrection of Jesus Christ has been from the first a principal article of the Christian creed. 'If Christ be not risen, then is our message vain,' is a sentence which, in some sense, would have been accepted by every Christian apologist since the days of St. Paul. He was not afraid to make Christianity answer with its life for the truth of the Resurrection of Christ, and upon this issue the controversy between Christianity and its opponents has generally turned. It is not possible to exaggerate the importance of its decision, and the present seems an opportune time for reviewing some of the objections which have been urged

against this article of the Catholic faith, and for rehearsing some of the considerations which support the belief of Christians that Jesus rose from the dead.

It will be admitted by all who have any knowledge of Christian history that the most fundamental and essential point of Christian belief has always been the conviction that Jesus Christ is living, and not dead. Whatever may have been disputed, this has always remained unquestioned by those who profess the Christian name. The conviction which has inspired Christian endeavour and Christian hope from generation to generation is the conviction that the Master of Christians is still alive; that He hears those who approach Him in prayer; that He is powerful to redeem and to bless; that His ministry was not ended by His death, but that it is still continued on earth and in heaven. The primitive Christians rested all their hopes on the belief that Jesus was a living Master. This is clearly set forth in every New Testament document, and it has always been confirmed by the spiritual experience of those who have learnt to pray. This is our starting-point. From the beginning Christians have believed that 'Jesus lives.'

It is hardly less clear that the reason why the first preachers of the Gospel held this to be true was that they believed that He had appeared on earth after His death. Their conviction of His continued grace did not rest solely on a general belief in an immortality into which they supposed Him, though invisible, to have entered. It was rooted in the experience of His most intimate earthly companions, who bore witness that He had been seen by them after His Body had been laid in the tomb of Joseph. One of the distinctions of the members of the Apostolic band was that they had been 'witnesses' of the Resurrection. When the place of Judas was to be filled, an essential qualification was deemed to be that the new 'Apostle' should be one of those who had seen the Risen Christ. Nothing could indicate more clearly the importance to the first believers of the fact that Christ had risen. They believed that 'Jesus lives' because they believed that Jesus rose. We may distinguish, with Harnack, between

the Easter Message and the Easter Faith; but it is certain that the latter, in the first instance, depended upon the former. We are still on solid ground. No sober critic challenges the good faith of the primitive believers as to their witness, although he may think that they were mistaken. Theories of fraud cannot be sustained. Dr. Schmiedel may be taken as representative of the modern school of critics who deny Christ's Resurrection; and these are his words: 'The followers of Jesus really had the impression of having seen Him. The historian who will have it that the alleged appearances are due merely to legend or to invention must deny not only the genuineness of the Pauline Epistles, but also the historicity of Jesus altogether.'¹

We have, then, to inquire what evidence remains to us of these apparitions of the Christ after His burial which satisfied His disciples that He was really alive, and that He had conquered death after a fashion which justified their worship of Him as the Prince of Life. It must be borne in mind that while the belief in Jesus as a Living Master would be abstractedly possible *now* to anyone who believes in a life after death, whether he accepts the fact of the Resurrection or not, the Apostolic belief in Christ's sovereignty rested, in fact, upon the conviction that He had given proof by His manifestations of Himself after death of a victory over death which was quite unique and extraordinary. St. Paul's affirmation that Christ was 'declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead,'² is in accordance with the whole tenor of the Apostolic witness. Through-

¹ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, iv. 4061. Schmiedel rightly abandons as quite unsatisfactory the theory that the Body of Christ was quietly removed from the tomb of Joseph—perhaps by the owner (*l.c.* 4066). This idea, which is adopted by Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus*, English translation, p. 499), has been given a wide currency in a recent sensational novel, but it is not worth discussing at length. It is on a par with the curious theory attributed (perhaps in irony) to the unbelieving Jews in Tertullian, *De Spectac.* (§ 30), that the gardener had removed the Body of Jesus lest the crowds going and coming might trample his lettuces.

² Rom. i. 4.

out the Pauline writings not only is the Resurrection of Christ regarded as a fact of such certainty that it may be used as the ground of symbolic language as to the new life possible to the Christian believer,¹ but incidentally it is mentioned again and again as the guarantee of the doctrine of the sovereignty and redeeming power of the Saviour.² It is unnecessary to rehearse the passages in which St. Paul finds in the Resurrection of Christ the pledge of immortality for the Christian³; but it should be noticed that even in the great Resurrection homily in 1 Cor. xv. no attempt is made by the Apostle to *prove* that Christ rose from the dead. That was not, for him and for his correspondents, a matter of dispute. Some of those to whom he wrote were in doubt as to their own future life, and he appeals to Christ's Resurrection as the confirmation and guarantee of hope, but he does not stay to prove that it took place. We shall return to his argument later on, but we may remark now that we entirely misapprehend it if we suppose, as Dr. Schmiedel does, that 'the Resurrection of Jesus was disputed' at Corinth.⁴ There is no hint anywhere that such was the case. St. Paul's argument throughout the chapter presupposes it as a fact and builds upon the universal belief of his correspondents in it. He reminds them that it is part of the Christian tradition which he had received and preached that Christ 'rose the third day, according to the Scriptures,' and that He appeared to Peter, then to the Twelve, after that to above five hundred brethren once for all (ἐφάπαξ), of whom the majority were living when he wrote; after that to James, then to all the Apostles. He adds that Christ had also, last of all, appeared to himself; but this is not part of the tradition to which he appealed, although it was a fact of which he was quite certain. Now we must observe that this enumeration does not pretend to be exhaustive, nor do St. Paul's words permit us to infer that he had heard of no other appearances of the Risen Christ. He is not

¹ E.g. Rom. vi. 4; Phil. iii. 10; Col. iii. 1.

² E.g. Rom. iv. 25; viii. 34; xiv. 9; 2 Cor. v. 15.

³ E.g. 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14; 1 Thess. iv. 14.

⁴ *Encycl. Bibl.* iv. 4057.

marshalling these incidents as evidence; he is merely rehearsing briefly the main facts, as well known to his correspondents, and as generally expounded by Christian teachers. These, then, were part of the Christian tradition when the Church of Corinth was founded—that is, about 50 A.D.; and not only so, but they were part of the tradition which St. Paul ‘received’ after his conversion—that is, as early as 35 A.D.

It is instructive to note the position and quality of the several witnesses enumerated in this stereotyped statement. We have, first, Peter, the leader of the Twelve, who is represented in the Acts as assuming the foremost place naturally and at once. This apparition to St. Peter is also mentioned by St. Luke.¹ Then we have the ‘Twelve’—i.e. the band originally chosen by the Lord as His companions. Of course, the number is not precise, for Judas Iscariot left them before the Passion; but the old designation remains in use. It is natural to identify the incident to which St. Paul refers with the appearance to the Ten in the upper chamber on the evening of the Resurrection,² or with the appearance to the Eleven (Thomas being present) a week later.³ But it is perhaps more correct to say that St. Paul’s *ᾠφθη τοῖς δώδεκα* would cover both these incidents, for, as has been said, the *number*—twelve—cannot be pressed. It is the manifestation of the Lord to the assembled company of His selected companions that is the point, and the absence of St. Thomas on the day of the Resurrection seems to have been what is called an accident; and so, even if others were present on the first of these occasions, as St. Luke’s language (*τοὺς ἑνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς*) has been thought to imply,⁴ the significance of the appearance would

¹ Luke xxiv. 34.

² Luke xxiv. 36; [Mark] xvi. 14; John xx. 19.

³ John xx. 26.

⁴ Luke xxiv. 33. This inference is not certain. St. Luke’s report is much condensed, and it does not follow because others were present when the two disciples returned from Emmaus (xxiv. 33) that they were present later on when the Lord appeared. Between vv. 36 and 37 an interval may well have elapsed, as is suggested by the paragraphing in Westcott and Hort’s Greek Testament.

rest in the recognition of the Lord by His chosen friends. This was from the first regarded as of fundamental importance, it being the recognition 'by witnesses chosen before of God . . . who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead.'¹

St. Paul next recalls an appearance to 'more than five hundred brethren once for all.' *εφάπαξ* can hardly mean 'at once' or 'simultaneously,' as it is generally translated, but is rather 'once for all.'² They saw the Lord together, indeed, for that is implied in the form of the sentence: as *ᾤφθη τοῖς δώδεκα* means that He appeared to the 'Twelve' when in company, so *ᾤφθη ἐπ'άνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς* means that He appeared to a body of more than five hundred persons, not that there were several separate visions, now to this small party, and now to that. But *εφάπαξ* implies that the occasion in question was the only one on which this large company of disciples had so wonderful an experience. Of this manifestation we have no other certain record. But it is apparent that it must have been in Galilee, for in Jerusalem the Lord had not so many adherents. Even after the Jewish believers were convinced of His Resurrection they did not muster more than 120.³ And, according to St. Mark (followed by St. Matthew),⁴ the women at the tomb were assured that Christ would appear in Galilee, the announcement suggesting that a signal and notable manifestation would there be given. It is not unreasonable to find a record of this in the account of the Appearance to the Five Hundred, and to identify it, as some have done, with the incident in Matt. xxviii. 16 f. St. Matthew, indeed, tells only of 'the eleven disciples' going into Galilee, unto the mountain which Jesus had appointed, but he goes on to speak of 'some' doubting⁵ when they saw Him. It is difficult to resist the inference that he knew that others besides the Eleven were present, and that those who doubted *after* they saw Him (a hesitation far beyond anything recorded of St. Thomas) were persons who had

¹ Acts x. 41.² Cp. Rom. vi. 10; Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 10.³ Acts i. 15.⁴ Mark xvi. 7 = Matt. xxviii. 7, 10.⁵ Matt. xxviii. 17.

not known Him with the intimacy that was the privilege of the Twelve.

We next come to the appearance to James—that is, James, the Lord's 'brother,' who was the official head of the Church at Jerusalem.¹ St. Paul never mentions James, the son of Zebedee, who fell a victim early to Herod's persecution.² Of this appearance we have no notice in the Gospels³; but it is instructive to observe how it falls in with what we are told of the Lord's 'brethren.' That they 'did not believe in Him' during the days of His public ministry is recorded in the Fourth Gospel,⁴ and so it is somewhat surprising to find them after the Ascension among the little company of believers,⁵ and to hear of one of their number as the president of the Church assemblies at Jerusalem.⁶ But if the Lord appeared to James during the days after the Resurrection the explanation is not far to seek. The incredulity of His 'brethren' could not persist in the face of so wonderful and gracious a sign, and the Church singled out for honour one who had been so highly favoured by the Church's Lord.

St. Paul adds that Christ appeared to 'all the Apostles,' the title being used in its wider meaning. St. Paul never confines the term *ἀπόστολοι* to the Twelve (although this restricted meaning appears elsewhere in the New Testa-

¹ Acts xii. 17, xv. 13; Gal. i. 19, ii. 9.

² Acts xii. 2.

³ The account of it in the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews,' preserved by Jerome (*Vir. ill.* 2) is destitute of any historical authority. 'The Lord, after He had given the cloth to the slave of the priest, went to James and appeared to him; for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which the Lord [reading *Dominus*] had drunk the cup until he should see Him rising from them that sleep; and again, after a little, "Bring, saith the Lord, food and bread," and immediately there is added, "He brought bread, and blessed and brake, and gave to James the Just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, because the Son of Man has risen from them that sleep."' This apocryphal legend perhaps is the earliest witness for a post-Resurrection appearance of Christ to a non-believer; but it is devoid of credit, and need not be discussed at length.

⁴ John vii. 5; cp. Mark iii. 21.

⁵ Acts i. 14.

Acts xv. 13.

ment),¹ and here he distinguishes clearly an appearance to the Twelve from an appearance to the Apostles. The manifestations in this list being set down in chronological order, it is not fanciful to identify the incident to which St. Paul refers here with the manifestation of Christ before the Ascension.² We could not, indeed, confidently infer from the Gospel accounts of the Ascension that others were present besides the Eleven; but Acts i. 22, which speaks of those who had companied with the Eleven from the beginning until 'the day that He was received up,' would seem to justify the inference which St. Paul's language suggests.

The final manifestation which St. Paul mentions was not included in the traditional list which he quotes. It was guaranteed for him by his own private experience; and, highly significant as it was and is, it does not come within the cycle of appearances which we have under examination; it was later than the others, and formed no part of the groundwork of the Church's faith at the beginning.

We should note at this point how remarkable a series of witnesses is here incidentally marshalled. The 'Twelve,' 'five hundred brethren,' 'all the Apostles'; these are groups as to which there could be no mistake. And Peter³ and James were, at the time of writing, the two most prominent persons in the Christian society, St. Paul himself not being excepted. That *these* witnesses of the Risen Christ should—even if there were others—be regarded as the principal witnesses, to whom the final appeal might always be made, is not difficult to understand. The three recorded appearances of the Risen Christ of which there is no mention in this summary—that to Mary Magdalene,⁴ to

¹ *E.g.* Rev. xxii. 14 (possibly also ii. 2); Jude 17; 1 Peter i. 1; 2 Peter i. 1; iii. 2, and regularly in the Acts.

² Luke xxiv. 50 f.; Acts i. 6 f.; [Mark] xvi. 14 f.

³ The importance attached to this manifestation appears from the fact that it convinced the Apostles when the report of the women had failed to do so. 'The Lord is risen indeed (*ὁ κύριος*) and hath appeared unto Simon' (Luke xxiv. 34).

⁴ [Mark] xvi. 9; John xx. 14; Matt. xxviii. 9.

the two travellers to Emmaus,¹ and to the Seven at the Sea of Tiberias²—have no more than a *private* significance. Mary's witness would not count for much in the mind of a Jew; and (in fact) the testimony of the women was not credited at first. The two travellers were not men of any special consequence, so far as we know. The appearance to the Seven in John xxi.—whether it be described by John the son of Zebedee or no we need not now inquire—is not of the same order as an appearance to the Eleven, or to the whole body of Apostles, or to the assembled Galilean believers. It is quite intelligible that these occurrences, important as they were, should not be recalled in the stereotyped summary of the testimony to the Resurrection of Christ which St. Paul quotes. And when Dr. Schmiedel urges that if St. Paul had known of any other appearances of Christ he would have mentioned them in 1 Cor. xv. 5f,³ he not only betrays his misapprehension of the point which St. Paul endeavours to establish—viz. the Resurrection of Christians, not the Resurrection of Christ—but he fails to recognize that the Apostle is here quoting a formulated statement which he had 'received.' It is a statement of testimony which in any other field of history would be regarded as of extraordinary weight, whether we have regard to its official character, its numerical strength, or the status of the persons who offered it. Even if, for the moment, we lay aside whatever corroboration for its details can be discovered in the Gospels, and decline to enter into the problems which a comparison with the Gospels suggests, we have in this short passage of 1 Corinthians a statement of evidence for the Resurrection of Christ which cannot be neglected by the impartial historian.⁴

An attempt has been made, indeed, to explain away this witness by supposing that, although those who gave it

¹ Luke xxiv. 13; [Mark] xvi. 12.

² John xxi. 1.

³ *L.c.* 4057, 4058.

⁴ We do not know what Dr. Schmiedel means by saying that 'the entire body of conservative theology denies any decisive importance' to 1 Cor. xv. 1-11 (*L.c.* 4055); in England, at all events, it has been usual to regard the witness of St. Paul in this passage as most weighty.

were entirely sincere, yet they were misled by visions of a disordered and ecstatic imagination, which had no objective counterpart. Peter and the rest of the Apostles, not to speak of Mary Magdalene, *thought* that they saw the Lord, when in reality they saw nothing but a picture which they had created for themselves. And so, as Renan put it: 'Ce qui a ressuscité Jésus, c'est l'amour.' The inadequacy of this theory has often been exposed, but as Dr. Schmiedel has recently attempted to revive it a few sentences must be devoted to it here.

1. That in circumstances of unusual excitement men have believed that they saw visions, when in truth there was nothing to see—no objective reality corresponding to the mental image—is, doubtless, quite true.¹ Such delusions have been experienced, and may be experienced again. But in all such cases there is a mental predisposition to see the vision in question. It is hoped for, prayed for, expected; and then it is seen. Now, there is no shadow of foundation for supposing that the Apostles expected to see the Lord again on earth. To all seeming the Cross was the end of His ministry. To find, as Dr. Schmiedel does, in Peter's remorse for the denial of his Master² the inspiration of his vision is the refuge of despair. A theory which needs such an hypothesis to prop it up is weak indeed. There is no trace anywhere in the New Testament even of a lingering hope in the minds of the followers of Jesus that they should be gladdened by His return to them after His shameful death.³ There was no expectancy such as might, under extraordinary conditions, mistake the wish for the fact.

2. Nor is this all that can be said; for if there *had* been such a predisposition, such a wonderful faith that it could survive the Cross and the burial, it is difficult to under-

¹ Origen puts the point clearly in his reply to Celsus: ὑπερ ὅναρ μὲν πιστεῖν γίνεσθαι, οὐκ ἄλογον ὕπαρ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ πάντῃ ἐκφρόνων καὶ φρενεζόντων ἢ μελαγχολώντων οὐ πιθανόν (*c. Cels.* ii. 60).

² *L.c.* 4085.

³ This is in marked contrast to the view of the position indicated in the passage cited above (p. 329, n.) from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, in which James is represented as looking for a Resurrection of his Master.

stand how it could have escaped record in the Gospels. Arguments *e silentio* are precarious, certainly; but it is legitimate to lay stress upon the omission of a circumstance so agreeable to evangelical piety and so honourable to the faith of the Eleven as the expectation of the Resurrection would have been. But the Evangelists, on the contrary, are explicit as to the incredulity of the followers of Jesus, even when they had been assured that the Lord was risen.¹

3. Those who speak of the delusions of the imagination must be asked to note that this is not a case of a vision seen by this or that individual, but of a vision seen by companies of persons—the 'Twelve,' the 'five hundred,' the 'Apostles.' Christian apologetic may have made too much of this in the past, for there are undoubted instances on record of 'collective' delusion, an idea conceived by one ardent soul being transmitted by the contagion of sympathy to others, until all are ready to bear witness that they have experienced the like.² But such instances are rare, and in every case where they have been observed conditions were present which predisposed and prepared the minds of the assembly for the experience in question. A plurality of witnesses increases manyfold the difficulty of explaining, as the creation of subjective fancy, the fact to which they bear testimony.

4. And, not to delay longer upon this part of our inquiry, it is necessary to explain, on the 'subjective visions' theory, why it was that they ceased when they did, and were experienced no more. That a vision which was entirely the product of a deep attachment to the Lord should take the form which the first believers have left on record in the story of the Ascension is not credible from the psychological point of view; for, without pressing here any details of that story, it amounts to this—that a company of men who had wrought themselves to such a pitch of enthusiasm that they simultaneously had visions of Jesus when He

¹ [Mark] xvi. 11, 13; Luke xxiv. 11; John xx. 9, 25.

² Schmiedel gives some instances (*l.c.* 4083); but they require closer scrutiny than he has given before they can be adduced as parallel to the visions of the Risen Lord.

was not there, learnt from one of these visions to expect to see Him no more. So completely was the lesson learnt that their unruly imaginations were forthwith brought under the control of reason, and their amazing experiences came to an end. That is not the course which a disordered fancy pursues. As Keim has it, 'the spirits that men call up are not so quickly laid.'

We hold, then, that the theory of subjective visions is insufficient to account for the facts, and that there must be recognized behind the recorded phenomena the operation of some force external to the minds of the witnesses. In other words, starting from the testimony of St. Paul, and laying no stress, for the moment, on any of the incidents recorded in the Gospels, we are led to the conclusion that the visions of the Risen Lord were *objective*—that is, they were due to an impression made upon the senses of the witnesses *ab extra*.

It is probable that everyone who recites the Creed, no matter what be the degree of laxity which he permits himself in the interpretation of its clauses, would agree with this conclusion. Various attempts, however, have been made to explain the article 'He rose again from the dead' in a manner less difficult of credence than that which the Christian Church has been accustomed to expound, and although we do not think that any of the modern theories of the Resurrection furnish a substantial aid to faith, it is right that they should have a hearing. Keim, for example, holds that the impression upon the minds of the witnesses was produced by the direct volition of God, who thus confirmed and certified their belief in Jesus as the Lord.¹ A 'telegram from heaven' was sent, as he puts it, and it took the form of a vision of the Christ. It is clear—and the fact ought to be recognized—that this theory is fundamentally different from that which appeals to individual hallucinations as the spring of Easter joy; for it traces the Church's faith in the Risen Christ to the act of God, and not to the easy credulity of man. But it is not so clear that this can afford any relief to those who

¹ *History of Jesus of Nazara*, by T. Keim [E.T.], vi. 364.

stumble at what is called the 'miraculous,' for it presumes the intervention of the spiritual in the physical order, and that, precisely, is the difficulty in every 'miracle.' And there is the further difficulty—to us we confess insurmountable—that Keim's hypothesis really requires us to believe that the faith of the Christian Church is based upon a revelation from Almighty God which was, in fact, misleading and untrue.

It may be said, however, that account should be taken of St. Paul's omission to tell of any such intercourse of the Risen Christ with His followers as the Gospels, written at a later time, describe, when they relate that He spoke to them, that He was touched by them, that He ate and drank in their company. Now it is undoubtedly the case that St. Paul tells of no such occurrences: the word *ὥφθη* implies only that the Christ was *seen*. But what does this avail in regard to the objectivity of His presence? If He were seen in reality, and not only in imagination, He must, Himself, have been present. Dr. Schmiedel asserts that it would be 'contrary to the nature of a being appearing from heaven' ¹ that He should be touched or that He should eat. But what are the grounds for such an assertion? Are we to be told that the sensation of *touch* demands an objective counterpart, after a fashion which is not demanded by the sensation of *sight*? Such crude psychology, or physiology, cannot stand for a moment, and Dr. Schmiedel's position is, of course, that the Christ was neither seen, heard, nor touched—that nothing was present but the creation of the fancy of the witnesses. That is an intelligible theory, and we have given some reasons for rejecting it. But to hold, as some critics seem to suggest, that the senses of touch and hearing require a material object to stimulate them, in a degree which is not required by the sense of sight, is quite unphilosophical. If Christ were really *seen*, there is no reason, so far as psychology can tell, why He should not be really *touched* and *heard*. The act of vision is quite as intimately associated with material processes as is the act of touch or of hearing;

¹ *L.c.* 4062.

and, on the other side, the true visibility of the Christ demanded a materialization, so to speak, of His Personality quite as much as speech or the act of eating.¹ We are deluding ourselves with a crude and unscientific and self-contradictory theory if we suppose that it is possible to believe that Christ was seen, yet impossible to believe that He was touched or heard. This *via media* between the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection and the theory of subjective visions only leads to a veritable quagmire of difficulty, from which there is no escape. The questions whether Christ spoke to His followers after He was risen, and whether they touched Him, are questions which must be decided by the available evidence, which we shall presently rehearse; but they cannot be ruled out of court by anyone who believes that He was actually seen.

Nor, once more, do we give due weight to St. Paul's language if we regard it as witnessing to nothing more than visions of Jesus after His Body had been laid in the tomb. There is a considerable amount of evidence for apparitions of the departed, and although we are not prepared to say that any modern instance has been as fully authenticated as the appearances of our Lord to the Apostles, yet it would be too much to say that the industrious investigations of science may not be competent in the future to furnish independent proof that visitations from the unseen world have been observed. And it has been supposed by some persons that the visions of the Risen Christ were phenomena of this character, and that they were no more 'miraculous' than the apparitions of the dead which from

¹ The text 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption' (1 Cor. xv. 50) is quoted by Schmiedel (*l.c.* 4058) as proving that St. Paul had never heard of Jesus eating or being touched after He was risen. This application of the words is extraordinary. In them St. Paul introduces the point that those who are alive, in the 'natural body,' at Christ's Second Advent must be 'changed' and put on immortality before they can inherit His kingdom. But the words have nothing to do with the nature of Christ's 'Spiritual Body' or the powers with which it was endowed, although they might be taken to suggest that His 'Natural Body' could not, untransfigured and unchanged, have been assumed into the heavenly places.

time to time men believe that they have seen. In this view they were objectively real, indeed ; but they had no further significance than could be found in the assurance which they gave the sorrowing disciples that their Master was still living in the world of spirits. And in this connexion emphasis is laid on St. Paul's omission to mention the empty tomb. He ' knows nothing ' of it is the current phrase. It is upon Christ's appearance *as spirit* that he rests his hopes ; and it is to this that he points the sceptics at Corinth. The story that the Body which was laid in the tomb of Joseph was revived is no part of St. Paul's teaching ; that was a later développement, which we find in the Gospels and the Acts.

It is necessary to analyze St. Paul's argument in 1 Cor. xv. in order to expose the inadequacy of such a statement of his doctrine of the Risen Christ ; but the analysis shall be made as brief as possible. Some persons at Corinth had questioned the current doctrines of a future life : ' the dead are not raised ' was the universal negative which they ventured to assert. To that St. Paul gives four answers, each of which begins with the hypothesis of gloom, *ἐν νεκροῖς οὐκ ἐγείρονται*, and proceeds to shew that consequences follow logically from it which the sceptics would not be prepared to admit. His method is that which logicians call the *reductio ad absurdum*, and his four answers begin respectively at vv. 13, 16, 29, 32. The last two need not detain us. At v. 29 he asks, ' If dead men are not raised, why is the rite observed of baptism on behalf of the dead (*ὕπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν*) ? ' Whatever this rite was (and we do not stay to inquire), it is adduced by St. Paul as a practical proof on the part of those who observed it, among whom the sceptics seem to have been numbered, that they *did* believe in a future life. And at v. 32 he says, ' If dead men are not raised, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die ' ¹ ; *i.e.* if there be no future life, *carpe diem* would be the only sane philosophy, the enjoyment of the present the only obligation for a wise man—a doctrine which needs no

¹ A citation from Isaiah xxii. 13.

refutation ; his argument being, again, a *reductio ad absurdum*.

We now go back to v. 13 :

'If there be no resurrection of dead persons—if dead men do not rise—then Christ was not raised. But you know that He *was* raised, otherwise our preaching would be void of content (*κενόν*), and our faith would be alike empty (*κενή*), and in that case the witnesses would all be liars. These are absurd consequences, and you would not press them. Therefore the Resurrection of Christ proves, at any rate, that there is *one* exception to your sorrowful maxim that "dead men do not rise." Christ appeared, after death, and in so far the veil has been lifted from the unseen world.'

Now, if this were the whole of St. Paul's argument, the view of the Resurrection of Christ which we have just indicated might fairly be attributed to him ; there is nothing in the argument *so far* which suggests that it was a unique event, or which would in any way demand the support of the Gospel story of the empty tomb. The argument rests on the *likeness* between the death of Christ and the death of all men : He is one of themselves, and a universal negative which includes them would include Him. But because it clearly does not cover His case it is not to be trusted when appealed to as covering theirs. The significance of His Resurrection is found in the revelation which it gives of the *possibilities* of the unseen world—of the *possibility* of life after death.

But this is not the whole of St. Paul's argument, nor is it the most remarkable part of it. He proceeds at v. 16, not at all to repeat what he has said before, but to develop a new thought. 'If dead men are not raised, then Christ was not raised, and your faith is vain (*μαρὰ*). Ye are yet in your sins. Even those who have fallen asleep in Christ are annihilated. . . . This, again, is absurd and impossible to believe,' and he goes on to explain why. The Resurrection of the Incarnate Christ was as real a crisis in the history of the human race as was the Death of the first man : as in the Adam all die, so in the Christ—the second Adam—shall all be made alive. This is the Gospel of

Redemption, and if it were not true faith would be (not now, *void of content*, *κενή*, but) *vain*, (*ματαιά*), worthless, and useless to any sinful man. Therefore, since this redemption in Christ of man from death as well as from sin is the revelation of the Gospel, it is absurd (this is his argument) to speak of death as the end. It will be observed that in none of these lines of reasoning does St. Paul endeavour to prove the Resurrection of Christ; he is endeavouring to establish something quite different, viz. the future life of man. At v. 13 he shews that this is possible for man in general from the analogy of Christ's Resurrection; at v. 16 he shews that it is guaranteed to those who are 'in Christ,' because Christ is 'the second Adam.' Either argument sufficiently oversets the arrogant negative, 'dead men do not rise,' which seems to have been repeated at Corinth, much as in a later age the similar maxim, 'miracles do not happen,' has been repeated as the last word of science.

It will, we think, be plain from this summary of St. Paul's palmary argument that he did not regard the visions of the Risen Christ as of precisely kindred import to the apparition of a dead hero or saint. Christ's Resurrection had for St. Paul a significance beyond its incidental revelation of the truth that men may live on after death; to him—we do not now inquire whether he were right or wrong—it had a *cosmic* significance. He accepted in a very literal sense our Lord's claim to be Himself 'the Resurrection and the Life.' As the ancient text, 'The first Adam became a living soul,' (*ψυχή*)¹ marks the crisis of man's creation, so 'The second Adam became a life-giving spirit' (*πνεῦμα*) marks the crisis of man's redemption, soul and body. For St. Paul Christ's victory over death did not reside merely in the fact that His spirit lived on—as the spirits of the just live on—in the world beyond the grave, but also in the transmutation of the mortal body of the flesh into the immortal body of the spirit, and in the demonstration thus given that the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* is but the forecast of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*.² The *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, which is our portion

¹ Gen. ii. 7, quoted 1 Cor. xv. 45.

² 1 Cor. xv. 46. We have not entered into the inquiry as to

in our earthly progress, is as the seed of which the fruit is the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* of the future. The former is not like the latter, indeed, for the seed is not like the fruit nor the end like the beginning. But as in the creation of Adam is the first seed of our race, sown afresh at each man's birth,¹ so in the Resurrection of Christ is the firstfruit of our redeemed humanity, to be reaped again and again in the resurrection of the saints.

It is not too much to say that, although St. Paul does not make explicit mention of the empty sepulchre, his argument, as we have traced it, presupposes the belief that the 'Natural Body' of Jesus had not been abandoned to the dissolution of death. Precisely at this point is there a difference between the Resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of His followers. For them the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* moulders in the dust, while they await the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* of the future life. But if Christ's 'Natural Body' had remained in the grave, no demonstration had been given in His Resurrection of that continuity between the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* and the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* which is implied in St. Paul's train of thought.² To be certified that

how our Lord's Body was raised from the tomb, or how it was withdrawn from the graveclothes. Those who desire to pursue this question—the answer to which, we think, is not within our knowledge—will find it suggestively and reverently discussed by the late Mr. Henry Latham in *The Risen Master*.

¹ This is a point in St. Paul's argument which is often misapprehended. The wonderful passage 'It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption,' &c. (1 Cor. xv. 42 f.) is often interpreted as if the burial of the dead body were typified by the 'sowing' of the seed. But a moment's reflection will shew that this is quite erroneous. 'That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die': the sequence is *sowing, dying, quickening*, in this order. Now, as the *sowing* comes before *death*, it cannot represent *burial*, which comes after death. The parallel to the passage about the different kinds of 'spiritual bodies' is the passage in Genesis about the different orders of created beings, and the key to the whole is the thought that man's birth is the time when the seed is sown—in corruption, weakness, and frailty during this mortal life—to blossom out after death into the perfect fruit. Birth and resurrection are the crises; death is but an incident or interlude.

² 'Christ sought to impress on His disciples two great lessons—that He had raised man's body from the grave, and that He had

there is such continuity is what men desire, and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ was unique because, in providing this assurance, it is 'the promise and the potency' of the resurrection of those who are in Him. It was not upon the apparitions of Christ as a spirit that the faith of the Church was built, but upon the manifestations of Christ's Spiritual Body, in which St. Paul found man's destiny to be revealed. Whatever we may think of St. Paul's argument, it is important that we should understand what he believed it to involve.

These considerations may be reinforced by other expressions of St. Paul which, as being easier to interpret, can be more briefly treated. For example, when he urges as an encouragement to holiness that 'if the spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His spirit that dwelleth in you,'¹ what is implied is that we may expect to find in our own earthly lives instances, on a lower plane, of that absolute subjugation of matter to spirit which was exhibited in the revivification in a glorified mode of being of Christ's 'Natural Body.' Every victory of the spirit over the flesh is but a faint picture of the victory of His Resurrection, in which the Body was not abandoned, but transfigured and transformed.²

glorified it. Nor can we conceive any way in which these truths could have been conveyed but by appearances at one time predominantly spiritual, at another predominantly material, though both were alike real. For the same reason we may suppose that the Lord took up into His Glorified Body the material elements of that human body which was laid in the grave, though, as we shall see, true personality lies in the preservation of the individual formula or law which rules the organisation in each case, and not in the actual but ever-changing organisation which may exist at any moment' (Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 108).

¹ Rom. viii. 11; *cp.* I Cor. vi. 14.

² Mr. Sparrow Simpson in his new work which is the latest addition to the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology' has some good observations upon this question, and the chapter which deals with it is, in our judgement, the best part of his book (*cf.* especially pp. 174, 176).

Or, again, what would be the bearing of the clause καὶ . . . ἐτάφη in the middle of the statement 1 Cor. xv. 3-7, unless the burial of Christ's Body was a matter upon which emphasis needed to be laid? There is only one explanation of the clause. It was inserted in this stereotyped formula for the same reason which has gained it a place in every Christian creed. It brings out the fact that the Body which was on the Cross was the same Body which, glorified and spiritualized, was the object of the adoration of the chosen witnesses. Even Professor Schmiedel admits this unreservedly. 'That Jesus was buried and that "He has been raised" cannot be affirmed by anyone who has not the reanimation of the Body in mind.'¹

We have dwelt on the witness of St. Paul at greater length than some readers may consider necessary. But his witness is so significant, and has been so unduly depreciated, that it has been worth while to shew how emphatic it is in regard not only to the objectivity of the appearances of the Risen Christ, but also in regard to the Apostle's belief that the sacred Body 'saw no corruption' in the tomb. We have confined ourselves to the evidence of letters admitted on all sides to be from the hand of Paul, and we find that it is entirely in accord with the sentiments ascribed to him in the Acts. In his speech at Antioch in Pisidia he is represented (in Acts xiii. 34 f.) as arguing that Ps. xvi. 10 is a prophetic forecast of Christ's Resurrection, applying the text exactly as St. Peter is said to have applied it at Pentecost.² 'He saith also in another Psalm, Thou wilt not give thy Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had in his own generation served the counsel of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption; but He whom God raised up saw no corruption.' In the Acts, just as in

¹ *Encycl. Bibl.* iv. 4059. How Dr. Schmiedel can reconcile this admission with the statement that St. Paul's silence about the empty tomb 'would be wholly inexplicable were the story true' (*loc.* 4066) is not easy to conjecture. For if Paul, and those from whom he received the formula 1 Cor. xv. 3-7, believed that the Body of Jesus was 'reanimated,' they must have believed that the tomb was empty afterwards.

² Acts ii. 31.

the Epistles, St. Paul is aware of the empty tomb. And there is no good reason for doubting that Ps. xvi. 10 was the passage in the minds of the early believers when they formulated the statement of 1 Cor. xv. 4, that Christ 'rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.'¹

Before we leave St. Paul one point more must be observed. According to the tradition which he had received, Christ rose again 'the third day.'¹ It does not seem that the first believers regarded this note of time as anticipated in any Old Testament text. The words of Hosea vi. 2: 'After two days will He revive us: on the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live before Him,' are striking, but there is no evidence that they were interpreted of the Resurrection in the Apostolic age.² The tradition of 'the third day' is not evolved from the exegesis of the Old Testament. But it might be thought that it was due to a recollection of predictions given by Christ Himself, such as those recorded by the Synoptists, and this alternative is sufficiently plausible to be worthy of a short examination; its discussion, at any rate, will serve to introduce us to the evidence of the Gospels for the Resurrection.

The first prediction of the Passion and Resurrection

¹ See also Acts xvii. 3, xxvi. 23. Ps. xvi. 10 is the only passage which the New Testament writers quote as prophetic of the Resurrection, and it is clear that its Christian interpretation was by no means obvious before the event. Indeed, there is no evidence that the victory of Messiah over death was part of the current Messianic teaching. The astonishment of the disciples at the empty tomb is explained in John xx. 9 by the reflection that 'as yet they knew not the scripture that He must rise from the dead.' For all that, the Lord is represented in Luke xxiv. 46 as teaching that His Resurrection had been foreshadowed: 'Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day.'

² In Jewish phraseology there is no distinction between the expressions 'on the third day' and 'after three days'; 1 Kings xii. 5, 12, and Esther iv. 16, v. 1 are Old Testament passages which are conclusive as to their identity of meaning, and in the New Testament we may compare Mark viii. 31 with the parallel Matt. xvi. 21.

³ Holtzmann lays much emphasis on this passage (*Life of Jesus*, English translation, p. 336); but his use of it is an afterthought of criticism. To appeal to 2 Kings xx. 5 as a text that has 'special relevance' in this connexion (Schmiedel, *l.c.* 4067) is mere trifling.

followed St. Peter's acknowledgment that Jesus was the Messiah. 'He began to teach them that the Son of Man must . . . be killed, and after three days rise again.'¹ The teaching was unwelcome, and the Twelve did not understand it, although it was often repeated. They were forbidden to tell of the Transfiguration 'until the Son of Man should have risen again from the dead,'² yet they could not repress the inquiry among themselves as to 'what the rising from the dead should mean.' So, a little later, while still in Galilee, it was said, '. . . When He is killed, after three days He shall rise again'³; but they 'were afraid' to ask the purport of the saying.⁴ Once more, as they go up to Jerusalem, the meaning of 'they shall kill Him; and after three days He shall rise again,'⁵ is not caught. Even on the eve of the Passion the Eleven did not perceive what was coming, and so did not heed the words, 'After I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee,'⁶ and were puzzled by the saying, 'A little while and ye behold Me no more; and again a little while, and ye shall see Me.'⁷ The Fourth Gospel is quite consistent with the Synoptists as to this.

Again, both the Synoptists and the writer of the Fourth Gospel agree that some of these predictions were made in the hearing of a larger circle than that of His disciples. St. Mark notes significantly that the first of such forecasts was spoken 'openly,'⁸ although Jesus forbade the disciples to tell that He was the Christ. St. John's statement that

¹ Mark viii. 31 = Matt. xvi. 21 = Luke ix. 22.

² Mark ix. 9 = Matt. xvii. 9.

³ Mark ix. 31, 32 = Matt. xvii. 22, 23; cf. Luke ix. 44, who omits here, however, any mention of the Resurrection promise.

⁴ In St. Matthew this is altered to 'they were exceeding sorry,' but we cannot doubt that the Marcan version is the more original.

⁵ Mark x. 34 = Matt. xx. 19 = Luke xviii. 33, 34. St. Mark and St. Matthew record the curious misinterpretation of these words by James and John. They thought that the 'rising again' pointed to an assumption of Messianic sovereignty upon earth, and they asked that they might share in its highest rewards.

⁶ Mark xiv. 28 = Matt. xxvi. 32. Not in Luke.

⁷ John xvi. 16.

⁸ Mark viii. 32. This is omitted by Matthew and Luke. Cf. also John x. 17, 18.

after the cleansing of the Temple He said to the amazed Jews, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,'¹ is confirmed by St. Mark's account of the charge before the Sanhedrin,² and his record that as Jesus hung on the Cross this enigmatical saying was cast in His teeth.³ These passages shew how questionable is Dr. Schmiedel's statement that, 'according to the Gospels, Jesus made prophecies of the kind only to the innermost circle of the disciples,'⁴ and also that it is not so incredible as he supposes that the Pharisees should have asked a guard for the sepulchre, because⁵ 'that deceiver said while He was yet alive, After three days I rise again.'⁶

To sum up, then, this part of our inquiry. No sayings of Jesus are better authenticated than those in which He spoke, in public as well as in private, of His approaching death and the victory which was to follow; but, at the same time, nothing is clearer in the Gospel history than the fact that these sayings were not believed or understood by those to whom they were addressed. They did not prepare the Apostles for the Crucifixion; still less did they prepare them for the Resurrection. The belief that Christ appeared among them on 'the third day' was not stimulated by any conviction based on His words that they were then to look for His revival; for, in fact, they had never interpreted His words of a Resurrection at any time from the tomb. This brings us back to the conclusion which we have already reached as to the inadequacy of the theory of subjective visions; but what we are now

¹ John ii. 19.

² Mark xiv. 58 = Matt. xxvi. 61. Not in Luke. ³ Mark xv. 29.

⁴ *L.c.* 4065 ⁵ Matt. xxvii. 63; see p. 352 below.

⁶ It will be observed that we do not cite the saying in Matt. xii. 40; the reason being that a study of the parallels irresistibly suggests the inference that it is an interpolation of the Evangelist, and not a Saying of the Lord. It does not harmonize with the argument of the context, which is given quite clearly in Luke xi. 29 ff., where the interpolation is absent. Mr. Sparrow Simpson quotes the saying, indeed, but his arguments throughout do not seem to us to allow sufficiently for the problems opened up by the comparative study of the Synoptic Gospels.

concerned with is the tradition that it was on 'the third day' that Christ rose. This St. Paul had 'received,' and there is no evidence in either Epistles or Gospels that it was originated by any cause other than the discovery of the empty sepulchre and the unlooked-for appearances of the Christ on the third day after His Passion.

A further inference of importance may be derived from what has been said. The form of the sentence *ὅτι ἐγγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ . . . καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾶ, εἰτα τοῖς δώδεκα* would suggest, *prima facie*, that the first appearances mentioned in this tradition took place on 'the third day,' and, if that were so, they must have been in Jerusalem, where Peter and the rest were at that time. But if this inference be not admitted as valid, and the Resurrection on the third day be certified as quite distinct from the visions of the Christ, *something* must have been observed on the third day which justified the assertion *ὅτι ἐγγήγερται*. And this could have been nothing else but the discovery of the empty tomb. If the tradition which St. Paul received is not to be interpreted as involving appearances in Jerusalem, it must be interpreted as bearing witness to the empty tomb. Thus the earliest extant tradition of the Resurrection demonstrates the inconsistency of the modern theories, that 'the first appearances happened in Galilee,'¹ and that the story of the empty tomb was an afterthought. These theories cannot be held simultaneously. In reaching this conclusion, be it observed, we have not appealed to the Gospels; and it is remarkable, therefore, how completely it is in accordance with their witness, which we shall now proceed to examine in detail.

The Gospel narrative which most nearly agrees with the Pauline tradition is, as we might expect, that of St. Luke, who was St. Paul's disciple and friend. He says nothing about a vision of the Christ by the women, but he records their experiences at the sepulchre, which led them to report to the Eleven that He was risen.² His narrative is

¹ Schmiedel, *l.c.* 4063.

² It is an important point that Matthew, Luke, and John all agree that the women reported the tomb to be empty before Jesus had been seen by anyone.

clearly based on traditions of the Christian Church in Jerusalem,¹ as distinct from the Galilæan tradition, which, as we shall see, was conspicuous in St. Mark, the disciple of St. Peter, and is followed in St. Matthew. The appearances of the Risen Christ which St. Luke records—to St. Peter, to the two travellers, to the Eleven in the upper room and at the Ascension—were all observed in Jerusalem. The tradition of that Church would naturally lay less stress upon appearances in Galilee, but that the Lucan narrative is *inconsistent* with the occurrence of such can only be maintained if Luke xxiv. be taken as an exhaustive report.² It does not profess to be anything of the kind, and a careful examination of this chapter discloses signs of compression which are most instructive. It does not contain towards the end express indications of time as distinct from place, but all the incidents which are narrated cannot have occurred on the day of the Resurrection. The supper at Emmaus would not have been earlier than about 7 P.M.; the day was 'far spent.' Then we must allow time for the return of Cleopas and his companion to Jerusalem, for the rehearsal of their experiences, for the recognition of Christ by the Eleven, for His partaking of food in their midst, for His exposition of Messianic prophecy, for His commission to the Apostles to preach throughout the world,³ for

¹ It has been pointed out several times by Dr. Sanday that St. Luke seems to have had, throughout his Gospel, access to some special source of information at Jerusalem (*cf.* Latham, *l.c.* pp. 136, 158, 160). Mr. Rørdam (*The Lost End of St. Mark's Gospel*, p. 772) finds traces of Hebraisms in ch. xxiv., but they do not amount to much. He acutely points out that v. 10 interrupts the sequence between v. 9 and v. 11, and that it is, therefore, to be regarded as an addition to his 'source' by St. Luke.

² Mr. Rørdam (*l.c.* p. 775) puts the case thus: 'The congregation in Jerusalem from the first would prefer to relate the Jerusalem appearances in giving their account of the Resurrection. The appearances in Galilee would, therefore, soon be omitted, or at any rate not very well known in Jerusalem. Hence the "forty days" which elapsed between the first and last Jerusalem appearances would not be emphasised, and would soon disappear altogether. The two events being thus narrated as immediately successive would leave the general impression that they happened on the same day.'

³ See Latham, *l.c.* pp. 155, 346, for considerations of another

the walk to Olivet preparatory to the Ascension. For such a series of incidents and discourses we require a longer interval than five hours. And it will hardly be maintained that Luke xxiv. 51 represents the Ascension as taking place at midnight.¹

The fact is that Luke xxiv. 44-52 is much condensed, and incidents and sayings which belong to different occasions are combined, after a fashion not infrequent in the Gospels. Had we no other record of the appearances of the Risen Christ we should not be able to disentangle these various discourses, although we should be perplexed to find room for them all on the evening of Easter Day; but, bearing in mind the compressed character of Luke xxiv. 44 ff., we see that it is not inconsistent with the chronological data of Acts i. 1-12,² according to which the command to remain in Jerusalem until the Holy Spirit had been sent (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4), and to preach thenceforth to all nations (Luke xxiv. 47; Acts i. 8), were given subsequently—probably just before the Ascension. We find, therefore, no difficulty in reconciling St. Luke's Gospel narrative with the record in the Acts of 'forty' days between the Resurrection and Ascension. And in this period time can be found for the Galilæan appearances which are elsewhere recorded.

character which make it difficult to believe that the Ascension took place on the day of the Resurrection.

¹ The words of the Epistle of Barnabas (xv. 9) ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην . . . ἐν ἣ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοῦς do not necessarily identify the day of the Resurrection with that of the Ascension; for while the writer seems to say that both the Resurrection and Ascension happened on a Sunday, he does not even suggest that they happened on the same Sunday (cf. Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 69).

² This later account, it may be observed, was intended by its author to be read in sequence to Luke xxiv.; it purports (*pace* Dr. Schmiedel, *l.c.* 4069) to be a *continuation*, not a *corrected edition*, of the former narrative. *E.g.*, to understand Acts i. 12, which tells of the Apostles returning from Olivet after the Ascension, we must have before us Luke xxiv. 50, which tells that they were led out from the city 'over against Bethany.' There is no mention of the walk from Jerusalem *towards* Bethany in Acts i. 1-11.

The witness of the Fourth Gospel is admitted by critics of every school to be independent of that given by St. Luke, and it is, therefore, all the more weighty when it corroborates the Lucan tradition. This it does remarkably, despite the obvious differences of detail. The order of events in John xx. (of which the earlier verses at least point back to the testimony of an eyewitness) is as follows: Mary Magdalene (with others, as appears from the plural οὐκ οἶδαμεν of xx. 2) visits the tomb, and sees the stone rolled away. She hastens to tell Peter and John, who go to see the empty tomb for themselves.¹ Then she sees two angels in the tomb,² and this vision is followed by one of the Risen Lord, which she reports to the disciples. Christ appears to them later on, in the evening, Thomas being absent; and, again, a week later, Thomas being present. As in St. Luke's Gospel, special stress is laid upon the identification of the Lord by the *stigmata* of the Passion³; and as in all the reports, the appearance of Christ to the Eleven is regarded as the palmary sign, the crowning proof of His victory. In an appendix (c. xxi.) a further appearance in Galilee to seven disciples is recorded,⁴ of which

¹ Cf. Luke xxiv. 24, ὁπῇθλιν τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν, shewing that Peter had a companion. Mr. Latham (*l.c.* pp. 112, 219) does not admit that this passage refers to Peter and John.

² St. Luke also has *two* 'men in shining apparel' (= angels; cf. 2 Macc. iii. 26). The only discrepancy between this and the Johannine account is that in the one case the vision of angels is placed before the tidings of the empty tomb has been brought to the disciples, in the other case after it—just the kind of discrepancy that might be anticipated in independent reports.

³ Luke xxiv. 40; John xx. 20. The passage cited by Ignatius from the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*ad Smyrn.* iii. 2) is, as Schmiedel rightly urges, dependent on Luke: καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς· λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἤψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν. We have already pointed out that there is nothing in the 'touching' recorded in the Gospels which is specially difficult of credence if the objective reality of the appearance of Christ be conceded.

⁴ Harnack holds that the Lost Conclusion of Mark lies behind this chapter, but we cannot think that the reasons given are sufficient. The affinity which he suggests between John xxi. and the Gospel of Peter is much more probable. The last words of the latter are:

there is no other account ; but by St. John, as by St. Luke, the stress is laid upon the appearances at Jerusalem.

In connexion with the Lucan and Johannine narratives we place the last twelve verses of St. Mark, which we do not count as part of the original Gospel, but as an appendix by an early hand. It corroborates these narratives, upon which it seems to be based, but it does not add to them any new matter noteworthy for our present purpose. It tells of the appearances to Mary Magdalene, to the two travellers, and to the Eleven in the upper chamber, and it records the Ascension, following what we have called the Jerusalem tradition.

We now come to Mark xvi. 1-8 and Matt. xxviii., the former of which is but a fragment of the original Marcan narrative. That throughout his later chapters the author of the Greek 'Gospel according to St. Matthew' reproduces closely the account of St. Mark, with additions of his own, is known to every student of the Synoptic problem, and in following their narratives of the Resurrection it is important to bear this in mind. We have already seen that in both Gospels¹ it is recorded that the Lord had announced, 'After I am raised up *I will go before you into Galilee.*' We should expect, *prima facie*, that the Evangelists who record this prediction would also record its fulfilment. Further, St. Mark (followed again by St. Matthew) begins his Resurrection narrative by telling that Mary Magdalene (she is always named first) and the other women were greeted by the 'young man' whom they saw at the sepulchre with the words: 'Go, tell His disciples and Peter that *He is going before you into Galilee*; there ye shall see Him, as He told you.'²

'I Simon Peter and Andrew went to the sea, and with us were Levi, the son of Alphæus, whom the Lord . . .' The scene is plainly the Sea of Galilee, and Andrew and Levi may well have been the two unnamed disciples of John xxi. 2. We cannot understand the point of Schmiedel's criticism, that 'the names of the Apostles on the shore of the lake are not the same' in both narratives (*l.c.* 4054).

¹ Mark xiv. 28 = Matt. xxvi. 32. This is not given by St. Luke.

² Mark xvi. 7 = Matt. xxviii. 7. It is instructive to notice how this was altered in the Jerusalem tradition, followed by St. Luke

However, in the extant part of St. Mark the sequel is not told. The last sentence says that the women fled from the sepulchre and told no one, 'for they were afraid . . .' (*ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ* . . .).

Let us observe, first, that this sentence cannot now be completed with any confidence.¹ *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ* might have been followed by an accusative of the person feared,² in which case *τοὺς στρατιώτας*—i.e. the soldiers of the guard, of whom, however, St. Mark has said nothing—or *τοὺς Ἰουδαίους*³ might be the missing words; or it might have been followed by a verb 'afraid to . . .'⁴; or by *μή* with a subjunctive,⁵ 'afraid lest they might . . .'; or the sentence may have ended with an adjective like *σφόδρα*,⁶ 'they were exceeding afraid.' But, however it ended, we are not entitled to conclude that, according to St. Mark, the women's silence remained unbroken,⁷ and that nothing further happened to them. All that can be inferred is that *up to the point which the story has reached* they had told no one of the empty tomb and of the message which they received there. But the next sentence may have

(xxiv. 6-7): 'Remember how He spake unto you *when He was yet in Galilee*, that the Son of Man must . . . rise again the third day.' This purports to be a reference to the first promise of the Resurrection in Luke ix. 22 (not Luke xviii. 33, as Mr. Rörðam says; *these* words were spoken on the way to Jerusalem).

¹ To say, as Holtzmann does (*l.c.* p. 496), that St. Mark 'closes with the women's visit to the grave' is to assume that the Gospel as we have it is complete.

² As in Mark xi. 18, *ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν*.

³ The Gospel of Peter represents Mary Magdalene as fearing lest the Jews should see her visiting the tomb.

⁴ As in Mark ix. 32, *ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι*.

⁵ As in Acts xxvii. 29.

⁶ As in Matt. xvii. 6; xxvii. 54.

⁷ As Dr. Schmiedel assumes (*l.c.* 4042, 4066). It is easy to illustrate the precariousness of such an inference. Suppose, *e.g.*, that instead of twelve verses a couple of chapters were missing from St. Mark, and that the extant portion ended with *οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν* (Mark xiv. 61). Would it then be legitimate to infer that St. Mark knew nothing of any reply made by Jesus to the high priest? Obviously it would not, for the narrative proceeds to tell that the next question put by the priest *did* elicit an answer. And so in the present case.

narrated their resolution to tell the disciples of their experience, which, in the circumstances, would be the course they would naturally take.

This is confirmed by the narrative of St. Matthew. Matt. xxviii. 1-8 is undoubtedly based on Mark xvi. 1-8, the Matthaean editor *more suo* amplifying his original and treating it with freedom¹; and thus Matt. xxviii. 9, 10, may be taken as giving a clue to what followed the enigmatical ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ in the Marcan account. Now, these verses tell of an appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene and her companion as they are leaving the tomb, evidently another version of the appearance recorded in John xx. 14-17 to Mary Magdalene alone. It is not explicitly told that the intimation of the approaching meeting in Galilee reached the Eleven, but it is implied.² In vv. 16, 17 the meeting is described, the words ἰδόντες αὐτόν of v. 17 having reference to the promise ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε of v. 7. Of this manifestation of the Risen Christ we have already

¹ E.g., the hesitancy of the women at first to tell of the empty tomb (Mark xvi. 8) is omitted, and their zeal in bringing the news to the disciples is emphasized (Matt. xxviii. 8). We have not laid any stress in our argument upon details for which St. Matthew is to be regarded as the sole authority. Here, as at other points in his Gospel (e.g. xxvii. 51, 52), incidents are mentioned for which we have no corroborative testimony, and which are hard to reconcile with the rest of the evidence. There are difficulties, e.g., in the story of the guard and the sealing of the sepulchre (xxvii. 62-66; xxviii. 11-15), which is peculiar to this Evangelist. The employment of legionaries to guard the tomb of a crucified provincial would be unlike Roman usage, although in this instance the fear of revolt in the name of the 'King of the Jews' may have inspired such an exceptional precaution (see also p. 345, above). It is still more difficult to understand why the soldiers reported their failure to keep watch to the *priests*, rather than to their superior officers (xxviii. 11), and to plead slumber as an excuse (xxviii. 13, 14) would have been out of the question for a Roman soldier. Further, the statement that the guards saw the angel who rolled away the stone is without corroboration, except in the Gospel of Peter, which tells of the vision of the Resurrection by the soldiers, and this last is apparently only an exaggerated reproduction of the Matthaean story.

² Like the narrative of St. Luke, the narrative of St. Matthew is condensed and compressed into a small space. See Sparrow Simpson, *op. cit.* p. 47.

spoken when examining the Pauline tradition. It may or may not be identical with the appearance to the five hundred (as we have suggested above, p. 328); but it is clearly regarded by the Evangelist as of signal importance, being the fulfilment of a repeated promise of Christ Himself.

We cannot doubt that the basis of the Matthaean narrative was the lost conclusion of St. Mark, which narrated, therefore, as we believe, an appearance to Mary Magdalene (or to the women generally), as well as an appearance in Galilee at which the Eleven were present. That St. Mark means to represent the Eleven as at Jerusalem on Easter Day is clear from xvi. 7, and if he recorded any appearance to them on *that* day, it must have been at Jerusalem.¹ But he meant to bring them to Galilee afterwards.² St. Mark (followed by St. Matthew) represents the Galilean tradition, of which we have another trace in John xxi. and in the Gospel of Peter.

We find, then, that while the Gospels preserve two distinct traditions as to the appearances of the Risen

¹ It is possible that the particular mention of Peter (Mark xvi. 7) was intended to lead up to the narrative of the appearance to Peter known to St. Paul and St. Luke; but the inference is doubtful. Dr. Briggs (*New Life of Jesus*, p. 115) and Mr. Rôrdam (*l.c.* p. 787) both argue that the original Mark contained an account of appearances to the women, to Peter, to the Eleven at Jerusalem, to the disciples in Galilee, and at the Ascension. This may have been so, but we do not think that more is certain than we have set down above. Mr. Rôrdam's excellent article deserves careful study.

² Mr. Rôrdam suggests that Matthew omits any notice of the appearance to the Eleven at Jerusalem for a reason similar to that which made him suppress the hesitations and fears of the women, viz. that he was scandalized at their unbelief in not accepting at once the angelic message, 'He is risen; go to Galilee to meet Him' (*l.c.* p. 785). However this may be, the Jerusalem appearance to the Eleven is represented in Luke, and especially in the appendix to Mark, as accompanied by reproach of the disciples for their unbelief in the report that He had risen (Mark xvi. 14). As Mr. Sparrow Simpson says, 'Galilee was first in intention, but Jerusalem first in fact. The contradiction between the order to go up to Galilee and the narrative of appearances in Jerusalem is due to conflict of will between the Master and His disciples' (*op. cit.* p. 61).

Lord, these are not inconsistent with each other. The Jerusalem tradition, as adopted by St. Luke, does not exclude the occurrence of appearances in Galilee, and the Galilæan tradition of St. Mark (followed by St. Matthew) began with an appearance of Christ to the women at the tomb. And although the Apostolic summary—perhaps formulated at an earlier date than either of these—which is preserved by St. Paul makes no mention of place, it suggests Galilee for the scene of the appearance to the five hundred hardly less clearly than it suggests Jerusalem for the appearances to Peter and the Eleven. No doubt a harmonistic table cannot be constructed on the principle that every syllable of every report must be infallibly accurate, and to assume a principle of this kind would be to introduce the gravest difficulties. But such a principle is no part of the Christian faith, and it is unnecessary to contemplate its logical consequences. The evidence for the Resurrection of Christ can survive the test of a close scrutiny, even though no postulate of minute inerrancy be made on behalf of the witnesses; and when so examined with an open mind, and without the prejudice that 'miracles' are impossible, it is found to be of a high degree of credibility. The variations in detail are not more or greater than might be anticipated from independent reports, while the minute correspondences which reveal themselves to a careful examination are very remarkable. The Pauline tradition, upon which we have spent most of our space, is the ultimate foundation of the Church's belief in Christ's Resurrection, and its force is not lessened because later narratives tell the wonderful story from different points of view.

There is a sense in which, as Ritschl and his school are forward to remind us, belief in the historical fact of the Resurrection must be distinguished from the belief in Jesus the living Lord. We are content to end, as we began, by affirming that the latter belief is the essential matter for the necessities of the Christian life, and we are ready to admit that no past fact of history can be certified by such guarantees as the intuitions of the devout spirit provide

for the present fact that 'Jesus lives.' It is, indeed, significant that the manifestations of the Risen Christ were made to believers alone, to those who had the faculties to discern the spiritual possibilities of a new life in Him; and it is still true that the evidences for the historical fact of Christ's Resurrection are incompetent of themselves to generate faith in the power and the grace of His Risen Life. It is still true that 'He is made manifest not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen of God.'¹ But, for all that, the certitude of the Christian believer can justify itself by an appeal to history, and when challenged it must be ready to make the appeal. The belief that Jesus *lives* must necessarily be a more intimate possession of the soul than the belief that Jesus *rose*; the one is a *religious*, the other but an *historical*, belief. Yet, were the latter discredited at the bar of critical science, it may be doubted whether the former would continue for long to dominate the lives of men, and it may, therefore, have been serviceable to summarize once more the evidence which has emboldened the Church ever since the Apostolic age to declare her confession of belief that Jesus Christ rose from the dead.

¹ Acts x. 41.

ART. V.—SCHOOL TALES.

1. *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. By THOMAS HUGHES. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1857.)
2. *Eric; or, Little by Little* (1858). *S. Winifred's; or, the World of School*. (1862.) By F. W. FARRAR. (London: A. and C. Black.)
3. *Schoolboy Honour*. By H. C. ADAMS. (London: Routledge, 1861.)
4. *A Day of My Life at Eton*. (London: Sampson Low, Marston, and Co.; 1877.)
5. *The Fifth Form at S. Dominic's*. By TALBOT BAINES REED. (London: R.T.S.)
6. *Boys and Masters—The Thing that Hath Been*. By A. H. GILKES. (London: Longmans, 1894.) *A Day at Dulwich*. By the same. (London: Longmans, 1905.)
7. *Tim*. By H. O. STURGIS. (London: Macmillan, 1894.)
8. *Gerald Eversley's Friendship*. By J. E. C. WELLDON. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1894.)
9. *Stalky and Co*. By RUDYARD KIPLING. (London: Macmillan, 1899.)
10. *Godfrey Marten, Schoolboy*. By C. TURLEY. (London: Heinemann, 1902.)
11. *The Hill*. By H. A. VACHELL. (London: Murray, 1905.)
12. *Hugh Rendal*. By LIONEL PORTMAN. (London: Alston Rivers, 1905.)
13. *The Upton Letters*. By T. B. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1905.)

I.

CONSIDERING how many writers of fiction have been educated at one or other of our public schools, it is surprising to notice how few have written about them; but the difficulties in the way of a successful school story are very varied and all but overwhelming. To begin with, the author has to rely upon his memory, and no memory is perfect. Even Tom Hughes and Mr. Lionel Portman occasionally forget. He will obtain no help from boys as to essentials, for 'the reserve of a boy is tenfold deeper than the reserve of a maid.'¹

¹ *Stalky and Co.*, p. 212.

He may revisit his old school, but even he will be able no longer to breathe its atmosphere; and there is a corporate spirit in schools proof against alien intrusion. Neither can an author hope to write a good school story until he is quite 'an old boy.' He must not be too near the picture; he needs a sense of perspective and the large tolerance which only comes with mature years. Thus few men are qualified for the task, and those few may well be daunted by the public which they have to address. For on school life a boy is a specialist—prone to fix upon blunders, real or imaginary, with something of the unholy joy of the pedant whose reviews are a list of errata. He is incapable, as a rule, of judging the merits of a book as a whole; he argues always on side-issues, and, conscious or not that inaccuracy is his own besetting sin, he condemns others for a detail. He decides hastily that some school story is 'rot,' making his author an offender for a word.

But if boy readers are hostile, professional critics are unsympathetic, and they after all determine the sale. Boys do not buy books—parents present them, and parents are guided by the reviews. Now, the critic has generally forgotten his own schooldays, but he keeps *Tom Brown's Schooldays* upon his shelves. The book is a classic, and naturally a standard for reference and comparison. Yet all school stories are not written upon the lines of *Tom Brown*, and hence the criticism is sometimes impertinent to exasperation. One reviewer, perhaps, praises the book as the best story since *Tom Brown*, but the many condemn it for its manifest inferiority to that masterpiece. Even *Punch* was unfavourable to *The Hill* after this fashion. He would have been as witty had he condemned *The Egoist* for lacking the excitement of *Ivanhoe*.

Given, however, a qualified man and indulgent critics, the theme itself presents extraordinary difficulties. For one thing the story is supposed to cover a period of five years, and they are years of rapid change and rapid growth. Now, many can describe a character, but few can develop one, and this is the real secret of not a few failures. Mr. Turley, for instance, begins in the most delightful fashion, but his hero, Godfrey Marten, altogether refuses to grow

up. The author himself was conscious of this, and makes the tutor exclaim, 'Godfrey, you are eighteen. Don't behave like a child of eight!'¹

A second difficulty is that the boy who does grow up tends to become less interesting from the author's point of view. It is easy to render attractive the irrepressible young scapegrace of thirteen, who tumbles into and out of scrapes twice a week, who 'cheeks' his betters, neglects his work, and gets whipped, fagged, and bullied perhaps more than he deserves; but it is hard to render interesting the admirable prefect—self-conscious, full of pride in his position, keen on the organization of school games, and nervous about the approaching scholarship examination. And yet Mr. Portman is right when he tells us that the last year at a public school is to many the best in their lives.²

Thirdly, public schools are organized down to the minutest details. Every hour of the day is mapped out, and every care is taken to prevent those exciting episodes which are the occasion of stories. In fact, the author of *A Day of My Life at Eton* is altogether sceptical as to 'hairbreadth 'scapes and exciting adventures' at school³; but adventures come to the adventurous, and the Etonian confesses to have been one who drifted with the stream. At the same time the possible incidents at school are limited, and the changes upon them have been rung over and over again. First come the father's parting words, and then the impression of loneliness in a crowd. Next appears the bully, who is subsequently licked. Then we are introduced to the hero head of the House, to the foolish master, the spiteful master, and the master who was 'no end of a fellow.' We are instructed in schoolboy honour as to sneaking, schoolboy practice as to cribbing, and the evil of schoolboy conversation. Poaching, smoking, drinking, and gambling afford the excitement. If the author be given to melodrama he may include a low publican with an eye to blackmail or cause someone to steal the cricket cash-box or an examination-paper. The much-loved friend, the quarrel

¹ *Godfrey Marten*, p. 302.

² *Hugh Rendal*, p. 240.

³ *A Day of My Life at Eton*, Preface.

and reconciliation, are generally kept for the latter part of the book; and the great match at cricket or football is reserved until the end in order to relieve the monotony of monitorial respectability.

Lastly, the author who would conciliate his public must not have an exceptional hero. Boys are intensely conservative and rigidly conventional. They object to 'Tim,' to 'Stalky,' and Mr. Portman's 'Marquis' for the same reason. They do not fit into their narrow scheme of things, and must in consequence be 'rotters.'

However, most of the books in our list were written by schoolmasters, and all have a more or less didactic purpose. It is natural, then, that the ideal set up for boys is that which the schools strive to achieve. There is no doubt as to the stamp of boy whom masters like, and it is such boys who derive most benefit from school. It is worthy of remark that school heroes rarely figure much in after-life; but then, as Mr. Portman reminds us,¹ public schools are designed for mediocrities. Perhaps that is well. The genius is said to be able as a rule to look out for himself.

II.

Having stated the difficulties, let us see how far they have been overcome, evaded, or disregarded; and it is natural to begin this inquiry with *Tom Brown's Schooldays*.

The author had one supreme advantage—he was first in the field and had not to bear a criticism based on comparison. Old Rugbeians were delighted with their school epic; and the world at large was ready to welcome anything about Arnold of Rugby. Dean Stanley's biography had been out a dozen years, and like most good books it aroused an appetite for more on the same subject. Tom Hughes was a hero-worshipper by nature, but he had too much reverence to be tactless, and was too much of a gentleman to be indiscreet. Hence, although the Doctor looms large in the story, though we feel him as the dominating power, he is like a Greek Divinity, and does not appear often upon the stage. This alone would give distinction to the

¹ *Hugh Rendal*, p. 30.

book, but the author had, besides, every qualification for writing a successful school tale. He was full of the *genius loci*. He could picture the incidents. He had been a manly boy; he was, and remained, a boyish man. Large-hearted, hot-headed, and open-handed, he could sympathize with the generous, wayward, and impulsive nature of boyhood. The rough-and-tumble of a barbarian republic appealed to him. He had a large tolerance for the facts of life and no tolerance for its cant. His exuberance often carries us away, but we are not in consequence ashamed. No one need be ashamed of sharing Tom Hughes' enthusiasms.

As for his tale, he was in no hurry; and it is of course impossible to write a headlong romance which covers eight years; neither did he pretend to give a complete presentment of school life. He skips a term or even two years without an apology. He does not try to make the Præpostor period of Tom's life interesting. After his boys get into the upper school his story turns upon personal questions outside the current of school life. Perhaps the last cricket-match is a trifle tame, and the master who acts the part of chorus at the close strikes us as a dull and solemn prig. But he is the only prig in the book. The boys are alive and natural. We like downright Tom, nimble-witted and nimble-footed East; and Arthur—yes, we like Arthur because he is so delightfully, and in the best sense of the word, feminine. Some boys are; but probably boys in general do *not* like Arthur for the same reason. They feel that he ought to have been a girl; and there is a prejudice against girls, however delightful, in those militant monasteries—our public schools.

But if Tom Hughes could write an account of a football match which is Homeric, if he could enter with his whole heart into a small boy's row with a keeper, he considered himself to be a preacher and was by no means ashamed of his calling.¹ He did not indeed set out to write a tale with a moral and fit the facts to suit it—that would have been alien to his character. He was just a simple English gentleman holding strong views on social and religious questions, and when the

¹ *Tom Brown*, Preface.

facts turned up in life or in literature he spoke his mind. Hence he has not only given us an unrivalled description of a school fight, but a characteristic comment :

'As to fighting, keep out of it if you can by all means. When the time comes, if it ever should, that you have to say "Yes" or "No" to a challenge to fight, say "No" if you can—only take care that you make it clear to yourself why you say "No." It's a proof of the highest courage if done from true Christian motives. It's quite right and justifiable if done from a simple aversion to physical pain and danger. But don't say "No" because you fear a licking, and say or think it's because you fear God, for that's neither Christian nor honest. And if you do fight, fight it out; and don't give in while you can stand and see.'¹

Compare this with a scene in *Hugh Rendal* where a similar question is discussed, and Tom Hughes as a preacher and a moralist will be found superior to his successors. It is sad to note that his book is no longer popular among schoolboys. This is not because schools have changed so greatly, for in externals they have not. It may be that 'the restfulness' which delights the author of the *Upton Letters*² does not appeal to the boy accustomed to the breathless rapidity of the modern tale. Perhaps, too, boys have become more sophisticated. But anyhow, this fact, if it be a fact, is much to be regretted.

We turn from *Tom Brown's Schooldays* to the works of Dean Farrar with a sigh. It is like leaving familiar converse on the uplands in springtime in order to listen to a rhetorician in a stuffy room. We are never free from the author, and we cannot escape from his diffusive eloquence. The very boys often talk as if they had read the Dean's sermons; and the masters are full of pietistic fervour, able expounders of the Dean's theology. He ever appeals to the emotions, and gives us no rest. High-souled, beautiful, and noble-minded boys perform feats of heroism—storms and the powers of Nature are invoked. Saintly boys die, but not without farewells—prayers, promises, and pathos. Sentimental boys call one another by their home names and act as affectionate

¹ *Tom Brown*, p. 250.

² *Upton Letters*, p. 100.

guides to little friends. But the purple patches are reserved for sin, and that is why these books are so dangerous for the young. It is not well to be too eloquent on such a subject, or to write allusively of Kibroth-Hattaavah.¹

Most boys are sentimental. They know it and are ashamed. They are also resolute to suppress their weakness, for they know that for them that way destruction lies. Mr. Vachell understands this, and in writing a book on a boy's capacity for friendship he has been careful to make his hero taciturn. Dean Farrar, on the other hand, revels in the sentimental. With the best intentions, he profanes the sanctuary of a boy's heart. Like Mr. Rowland Martin, M.P., in Mr. Kipling's tale,² he does not know his audience or realize that what may be good for middle-aged grocerdom is very bad for boys. When Mr. Farrar wrote *Eric* he knew somewhat about boys and comparatively little of public schools; in his later books he shews an intimate knowledge of schools but has lost his power of drawing boys. For, much as we dislike *Eric* as a book, we are fain to admit that the hero is in some sense a powerful study. Lack of grit, lack of breeding, and an emotional temperament were his ruin. His gradual degeneration is convincing. The circumstances necessitate it; but we cannot forgive the author who invented them. In real life the fates are not so hard, in a real school there is never quite so much incompetence, in a real boy there is not that logical consistency in failure.

How, then, are we to account for the enormous sales of *Eric* and *S. Winifred's*? Most boys have read these books, and few boys like them; but they appeal to mothers. Women know very little of boys between thirteen and seventeen; but they wish to help their sons against the perils of school life, and of these they know nothing. They like the sentiment and piety of the Dean. It is they who choose and they who buy. How many boys buy books for themselves?

If this surmise be correct, Mr. Kipling wrote for the wrong public when, with a laudable wish to supplant Dean

¹ *Eric*, ch. ix. ² *Stalky and Co.*: 'The Flag of their Country.'

Farrar, he produced *Stalky and Co.* Every man has his limitations, and Mr. Kipling rarely appeals to women. Many, however, objected to *Stalky and Co.* who were not even old women. Old public-school boys decried it because it did not remind them of their school. Masters denounced it for holding up to admiration boys whom they held up to scorn. Boys scoffed at it because in some ways *Stalky and Co.* were exceptional and in other ways were more like boys than boys care to have represented. All who disliked it, disliked it the more because the scenes carried conviction and the actors were so terribly alive.

The school was not a typical school, but the author makes this abundantly clear :

'The last census showed that 80 per cent. of the boys had been born abroad—in camp, cantonment, and upon the high seas ; 75 per cent. were sons of officers in one or other of the services' (p. 210).

"You see," explains M'Turk, "it isn't as if we were an ordinary school! We take crammers' rejections as well as good little boys like *Stalky*" (p. 133).

"We aren't a public school," says Flint. "We are a limited company payin' 4 per cent." (p. 166).

And this strange school was run by a strange headmaster—"that amazing man"¹ who took his after-dinner cheroot in a boy's study and referred to himself as a 'downy bird.'² And yet at this school they did not drink, gamble, and steal, neither were they the victims of disgusting vices. In fact, the boys were more moral and cleanly than those in Dean Farrar's pious romances. But the school for all that is not a good one ; for good schools exist to keep Stalkies within bounds, to teach boys that in civilized communities liberty results from harmony with law, and to check the savage instinct of fighting for one's own hand. The ordered games, the old traditions, and the solidarity of a great school are all useful to this end, but Mr. Kipling despises them. For him civilization means the power to keep subject races in order. His college did not educate ; but the boys in it educated themselves and one another, by failing and by

¹ P. 35.

² Pp. 167, 169.

learning to hold their own. It was not a bad training for life in the Outlands.

Stalky and Co. were lovers of war for its own sake, and fought with high good-humour whether they lost or won. They acknowledged defeat and accepted the penalties cheerfully; they pursued their vendettas without remorse and spared no one. They admired the Head, for he was a kindred spirit and dealt with them on their own terms. They liked the chaplain as a neutral power, and were flattered by his appreciation. Their positive faults are typical of their age. They were callous to the feelings of others—most boys are. They used coarse expressions—most boys do. They had a command of language that staggered an old sergeant,¹ but most of them had been born by a barrack-yard. They were not always nice in their manners, but they were natural. The scene out of bounds with a long cigar² is frankly disgusting, but it is an experience which has happened to many. There is only one action in the book that is not at once forgiven. M'Turk ought to have called Beetle 'the Gadarene swine'³ when he scratched Mr. King's bound volumes with a sharp flint.⁴

No! It is not by their positive faults, but by their amazing cleverness, that they surpass the conventional standard of boyhood. One critic remarks:

'My own experience is that no boys could keep so easily on so high a level of originality and sagacity. The chief characteristics of all the boys I have ever known is that they are so fitful, so unfinished. A clever boy will say incredibly acute things, but among a dreary tract of wonderfully silly ones. The most original boys will have long lapses into conventionality, but the heroes in Kipling's book are never conventional, never ordinary.'⁵

The remark is true about boys, but the criticism is wide of the mark. Mr. Kipling has not written a story, but stories. They celebrate 'the gloats' of Stalky and Co., and do not profess to be a history of their lives.

We cannot help liking the triumvirate, but we deplore their deficiencies. Self-sacrifice, self-suppression, and rever-

¹ P. 204.

² P. 161.

³ P. 210.

⁴ P. 57.

⁵ *The Upton Letters*, p. 100.

ence are rarely conspicuous in boys ; but we feel that they understand these virtues. Stalky and Co., however, knew nothing of them ; they knew nothing, too, of duty, and they owned no loyalty but to their own hooligan league. They were young Ishmaels in a school governed by a man who ought to have been an outlaws' chieftain.

Mr. Kipling reveres the 'Prooshian Bates' as a man after his own heart. The other masters he looks at through the eyes of a schoolboy and views them with humorous contempt. Boys who refuse to believe in Stalky, Beetle, and M'Turk will tell you that King, Prout, and Hartopp are all to be found in their own schools. They are types treated unsympathetically, but the 'Prooshian Bates' is also a type, though treated with sympathy. He had been the clever Bohemian undergraduate who, with no definite prospects, had drifted into schoolmastering because he had a 'Blue' and a First Class to his credit. Living among boys, he had not developed, but retained his conceit in himself by retaining a youthful affectation of being unconventional. A man who thought it worth while to tell two distinct companies, 'I can connive at immorality, but not at impudence,'¹ was very careful of his reputation for originality.

After all, conventions are necessary if life is to run smoothly, and subordinate officials do not thrive under an erratic chief whose conduct it is impossible to forecast. An administrator who happens to be a genius will only succeed if he disguises the fact. And it is as an administrator that 'the Prooshian Bates' proves himself a failure. In twenty-five years he had created no traditions and was not supported by his staff, who were all at sixes and sevens. He could beat Stalky at his own game, but in seven years had found no use for him in the school. 'Seven years, my dearly beloved 'earers—though not Prefects,' says the impenitent hero.² Now most schoolmasters would have decided long before either to get rid of Stalky or to make him a Prefect. Most would have ventured on the riskier alternative. It might not have been good for the school, but it would certainly have been good for

¹ Pp. 185-186.

² P. 220.

Prout's house. The honour of that house would have been safe in his keeping, and the members of that house would have done as they were told without overmuch questioning. Responsibility, too, would have been good for Stalky, and as a Prefect he would have come into closer contact with the headmaster whom he admired. Only, 'the Prooshian Bates' did not see it, notwithstanding his insight into boy nature and his instinct for decisive action. Well, many will rejoice that he was what he was, for otherwise we might have lost some excellent stories. *Stalky and Co.* has been better liked than praised.

The Hill, by Mr. Vachell, on the other hand, has had a unique success. Here is a book all about schoolboys and their doings which has found its way into drawing-rooms and clubs, has been discussed over dinner-tables, and has aroused an intelligent interest in one public school. The reason is not far to seek. *The Hill* is not a school tale; it is a novel with a plot and a problem. The story centres round three boys; the plot is how two of them fight for the soul of the third; the problem concerns the evils of materialism. Some have objected that Mr. Vachell magnifies the importance of school life; but a novelist has a perfect right to select his own time, and the critic has only to see that in the time selected the development is possible. There is no age in life which may not be a turning-point. As Mr. H. O. Sturgis says about his sad little hero¹: 'To a boy of Tim's organisation, fourteen is an age quite ripe for crises.' In fact, a child's after-career may be determined at so early a date that we cannot speak of a turning-point at all—it is just a start that runs to a finish. So the decisive years may be those at school. They were for Cæsar Desmond, who died at nineteen leading a forlorn hope in the Boer war. By allowing him to die, Mr. Vachell has refuted beforehand the criticism of the reviewer.

Mr. Vachell's first concern is with his story, but for all that he has given us a brilliant picture of life at Harrow. He does not describe the life in detail, but we are ever conscious of where we are, we cannot escape the *ἦθος* of the

¹ *Tim*, p. 190.

place. Old Harrovians are satisfied with the description, and, it may be, some non-Harrovians are glad they went to some other school. These latter will remain incomprehensible to Mr. Vachell, but their decided opinions are a testimony to his realistic power. Very cleverly, too, has he utilized the old stock incidents as to drinking, gambling, cribbing, work, and games to illustrate his theme. He has written, for instance, what is perhaps the best description of a cricket match ever penned; but each incident bears on the characters of his boys and furthers the action of his story. John Verney, Scaife, and Desmond are not ordinary boys, neither are they abstractions in Harrow straw hats. They are carefully executed portraits. Nothing so subtle as the character of Scaife has ever before been attempted in schoolboy fiction. There is not indeed in *The Hill* anything to compare with Mr. Kipling's lightning intuitions; it is the result of meditation and has been deliberately constructed to express 'the sentiment and strenuousness' of which boys are capable.

And what a contrast there is between *Stalky and Co.* and the three boys in *The Hill*! It is not merely the contrast between Harrow and Westward Ho!—it is the contrast between the exuberance of wild life and the intricacies of civilized existence. The young men in *The Hill* come from rich homes; they are in touch with the world they ape; they feel its problems before they face them; they use its language without complete understanding, and they cannot apply its principles. They are not all so honest as the Caterpillar who added to his dicta, 'Not mine, but my governor's, you know.' Throughout Mr. Vachell allows his boys to talk a little like men, and he often makes them act like children. Boys, in fact, are imitative and easily acquire the language of their elders. Their wits, too, are sharp and they are probably as intelligent at eighteen as they will be at forty; but they lack experience, and their judgement cannot be depended upon.

Happy are the boys who have Warde for a master! He is keen on work and keen on games; he has the wisdom of a man and the heart of a boy. His manners and his speech

at times are boyish also, but in action he is ever simple and direct. Moreover, he believes in his work and believes in his school ; and there is a need of such idealists if boys are to be inspired with a sense of vocation and prepared for the possibilities of life.

The last successful school tale is Mr. Portman's *Hugh Rendal*. The school which he calls Larne is Wellington. He describes it with a journalist's fidelity to fact ; and he has the facility of a journalist in comment. Lest this should sound depreciatory, let us explain that he has a Defoe-like power of presenting fiction as a commonplace narrative of events. He follows in some ways in the tradition of Tom Hughes, but he lacks the spontaneity of the old Rugbeian. His book was not written in a single vacation. The material has been collected, arranged, classified ; every possible incident has been touched on, every problem discussed. *Hugh Rendal* is the most complete school tale ever written.

The hero is a real boy, in no way exceptional, but with an individual charm hard to define. Perhaps this is due to the sympathy of the author. He passes through many vicissitudes, develops his powers and is developed by his surroundings. He really *does* grow up. In Mr. Kipling's phrase, 'he finds himself' when set to rule a dormitory terribly out of hand. He has been evolved from within with complete understanding ; most of the other characters have been observed from without and are mere photographs. We would except the pleasing sketches of Mr. and Mrs. Gurney ; and we are glad that once Mr. Portman gave rein to his imagination and invented the Marquis who was called 'Smith.'

As regards the comments, Mr. Portman is eminently sane. He never lets enthusiasm or indignation carry him away. He knows all the excuses that may be urged for what is worst in school life and boy nature, and is in consequence temperate and judicial. He is also eminently conventional. He never deviates from the public-school standpoint. His moral standard is high, but it is not Christian. Religion he does not understand. Like Dr. Welldon in *Gerald Eversley's Friendship*, Mr. Portman tells how a silly

and pious woman goaded a son into rebellion by inappropriate admonitions. But this hardly excuses his *ὕβρις* when he writes :

‘She was one of those parents who think the Church is the source of all good. Judging from the way in which its principles are forced upon most English boys, it is a marvel that any of them grow up with any moral sense at all.’¹

Notwithstanding such remarks, we should like all mothers with boys at school to read this book. It will not affect their piety, and may teach them discretion. We should like all fathers to read it also, and ask themselves why it is that ‘a father, if he has any strong religious convictions, would as soon face a firing party as speak of them to his son’ (p. 216). And we should like Mr. Portman to ponder why the admirable Lowden was a prig, and justly unpopular with his fellows.

III.

‘Public schools,’ Mr. Portman tells us, ‘are, as a rule, as good as human effort can make them, but they are not heaven.’² As the majority of school tales have been written by schoolmasters, and the minority by enthusiastic old boys, they should afford evidence for testing the truth of this statement.

Most of the tales speak of drinking, gambling, and stealing. Scandals of this sort happen, but at such rare intervals that they are scarcely worthy of being taken into account. On the other hand, bullying, cribbing, and indecent talk are generally pretty common, while the utmost vigilance cannot altogether stamp out the peculiar vice of schools. On this last point our authorities are necessarily discreet. They are more explicit on bullying. ‘Active corporeal bullying had gone out of fashion before his day,’ says Mr. Sturgis in *Tim*³; but it would be more exact to say that public-school opinion is opposed to bullying; and then we should have to add that a boy and his mother would probably define bullying in very different terms. Stapleford, a monitor, in

¹ *Hugh Rendal*, p. 125.

² *Hugh Rendal*, p. 7.

³ *Tim*, p. 98.

Schoolboy Honour, assures two new boys that they need not fear being bullied as he had been, for all the bullies had gone long ago. Mr. Wolcott, the guardian,

'remembered having received the same assurance, couched in almost the same words, when he first entered a public school some five-and-thirty years before; and also having made it himself to the parents of a new boy in the last year of his continuance at school.'¹

As the chaplain says in *Stalky and Co.*, 'We're all inclined to say that everything is all right, so long as we ourselves aren't hurt.'² Beetle indeed confesses, 'Fags bully each other horrid,' but from the altitude of the Upper Fifth he does not consider this of any consequence. He forgets that when, six years before, he came to the College, the boy who made his life a misery was not far above him in the school. It is 'the strong young dog of fourteen' who bullies the weakling of his own age.³ He rejoices in his strength and loves to exercise it. As Hugh Rendal said of Trollope: 'He's simply a great cheery hulk who lands you an awful kick now and then, just because he's so fit.'⁴

But all bullying is not of this inconsiderate kind. In *Hugh Rendal* we have not only Trollope but Barrie. And in many a school house a like unequal sort of duel proceeds. On the one hand a boy with spirit and a temper, and on the other a tough young rascal who takes a malignant delight in provoking the temper that he may prove the superiority of his muscles.

Thirdly, there is the witless brute like Maice⁵—strong, tyrannous, and bad-tempered—who, because he is not liked, chooses to be feared, who sees little boys above him in form and makes them bow before him out of school, who by hard knocks and cruelty maintains an ascendancy which he ought not to have.

Fourthly, there is the Cales type⁶—the clever vicious boy who finds in cruelty a sensual delight. It is of such that

¹ *Schoolboy Honour*, p. 34.

² *Stalky and Co.*, p. 135.

³ *Tom Brown*: Preface.

⁴ *Hugh Rendal*, p. 80.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

M'Turk says: 'Bullies like bullyin'. They think it up in lessons and practise it in quarters.'¹ Such a one causes Godfrey Marten to declare: 'I hate saying it, but it does seem to me when a boy is a brute, he is a far greater one than any other human being.'² With admirable judgement Mr. Portman makes Cales a coward. It is the coward whose morbid imagination revels in tortures. The other boys were fearless. In fact, an insensibility in themselves accounted for the pain that they inflicted. The Maices may be excluded for the most part by a rigorous rule of superannuation; and efficient Prefects will be able to suppress boys like Cales. But Barrie will as a rule escape scot free, and Trollope will improve as he gets older.

After all, a certain amount of Spartan training is not bad for boys. The young gentleman from a private school with an exaggerated sense of his importance does not come into conflict with authority, but is properly disciplined with the back of a hair-brush or the sole of a 'gym' slipper. It is all for his good. But our hearts go out to the little sensitive boys with some peculiarity of speech or manner or innocence. For, as Mr. Sturgis says, their companions 'possess the art of wounding by words and looks to a perfection quite unknown to the other sex in any stage of development.'³ Tim and Gerald Eversley were not fit for, and should not have been sent to a public school. Other boys worry through, but probably nobody enjoys overmuch his first year. As Warde says in *The Hill*:

'Some jolly old boys—we all know 'em and like 'em—are always saying that their early schooldays were the happiest of their lives. They are fond of telling this big lie just as they are settling down to a bottle of port. I believe that they believe what they say, but it *is* a lie. The smallest boy here knows it's a lie.'⁴

What little boys find strange at first is a world in which woman has no place, and where the feminine virtues are disregarded. On their behalf Mr. Sturgis asks ladies to invite any such little boys as they may know to come

¹ *Stalky and Co.*, p. 135.

³ *Tim*, p. 98.

² *Godfrey Marten*, p. 253.

⁴ *The Hill*, p. 141.

to spend the day with them. 'They won't want amusing,' he says. 'It will be happiness enough to get away from school and into a home for an hour or two.'¹ Perhaps it may be objected that the author was thinking only of Tim and boys of like temperament; but the same lesson is taught us when Tom Brown is received into the headmaster's family or meets Mrs. Arthur²; while Mr. Portman, who is not sentimental, has invented a delightful rôle for Mrs. Gurney.³ With all due deference to the views of Beetle,⁴ the wives of masters may be very useful in the education of boys.

Our public schools are famed for manliness, but the manliness which they tend to inculcate is that of the savage. 'Boys do not mind bluntness, roughness, or even gruffness of manner,' says Dr. Welldon,⁵ and they pride themselves on being what they tolerate in others. In their aspiration to be men, they hide the principles and recant the creed which was taught them in the nursery. They pretend a disrespect for the finer virtues and express detestable views on the subject of sex. This is partly due to the fact that knowledge comes to them through the wrong channels at the wrong time, but it is due also to the isolation of their lot, to the monastic spirit that pervades our schools.

It is hardly to be wondered at if boys be coarse. They often are. 'There is,' says the author of the *Upton Letters*,⁶ 'a Rabelaisian plainness of speech on certain subjects.'⁷ And if this be true of Eton, devoted to the little tin gods of 'good form,' it is true also of less civilized communities; but few school tales treat it aright. Mr. Kipling, indeed, has no aversion from nakedness of speech. Stalky and Co. are quite coarse enough to displease the precisians; but their interpreter never lets one suspect that they crossed the rubicon of decency. Dr. Farrar denounced such talk with perfervid rhetoric—it was for him the sin that damned. Mr. Portman never refers to it at all. It is his one omission.

In considering the matter it is well to remember that

¹ *Tim*, p. 99.

² *Tom Brown*, pp. 185, 186, 264.

³ *Hugh Rendal*, *passim*.

⁴ *Stalky and Co.*, p. 132.

⁵ *Gerald Eversley*, p. 86.

⁶ P. 107.

⁷ *Upton Letters*, p. 107.

language which shocks us was quite natural to Queen Elizabeth, and fills the vituperative pages of Protestant divines. It is charitable, then, to conclude that in most cases such talk proceeds from lack of refinement rather than from propensities to vice. An open sewer is offensive, but not dangerous. In fact, we have heard of schools where filthy talk was considered 'bad form,' and have been told that they were by no means free from beastliness. We read in *The Hill* that

'The Caterpillar was an agreeable gossip, because he condemned nothing but dirt and low breeding. . . . "The best men don't swear much," he would say. "It's doosid bad form. I allow myself a damn or two, nothing more." . . . The Caterpillar looked at everybody and everything with the eyes of a Colonel in the Guards.'¹

Now, we would not say a word against the Caterpillar or the Guards; but we would rather that a boy's standard of modesty were *influenced* by association with good women than by any abstract theories as to what was 'good form.'

The two words 'good form' have taken the place of 'honour,' and we are not sure that the change indicates an improvement. 'Honour,' indeed, suggests the eighteenth-century duellist, obedient to a narrow code and lax as to all which it did not command; but 'good form' suggests a tailor's model and a smooth humanity anxious about appearances. Neither conception is very Christian, but which is the higher? This was brought home to us while reading *Schoolboy Honour*, by H. C. Adams. It is a capital tale, but the moral, like the style, would seem to most boys out of date. Mr. Gilkes, in *The Thing that Hath Been*, has resuscitated Socrates to quiz our latest fetish. It is scarcely a book for boys, but it should make men think.

Masters are obliged to deal with boys upon honour so far as the preparation of their lessons is concerned; but, if we may judge by our authorities, cribbing is too prevalent for honour's voice to be heard. Not only the wicked boys of Dr. Farrar,² but the admirable Caterpillar, pin their

¹ *The Hill*, pp. 78, 177, 191.

² *Eric*, ch. v.

repetition to the master's desk.¹ It is true that the daring of the deed and the incompetence of the master in some way extenuates the fault. Cribes are probably not so widely used as our tales would lead us to suppose. The Caterpillar, who insisted on Verney and Duff doing all his work, objected to them. 'You kids ought not to use "Bohns." Besides, it's dangerous.'² Many boys abstain from cribes from a higher motive, but most agree with Scaife: 'Our object is to get through the "swat" with as little squandering of valuable time as possible.' Hence co-operative work, reduced by Stalky and Co.³ to a system, and known as a system at Arnold's Rugby,⁴ at Harrow,⁵ and in Hugh Rendal's *Corunna*.⁶ And on this point the boy calls casuistry to his aid. What is the difference between co-operative work and getting assistance from a good-natured prefect or a weak-minded tutor? When Tom Brown gave up cribes, Harry East was able to argue:

'Your new doctrine, too, old fellow, when one comes to think of it, is a cutting at the root of all school morality. You'll take away mutual help, brotherly love, or, in the vulgar tongue, giving construes.'⁷

Perhaps it would be well for bad boys' morals and better boys' chances that translations were freely allowed. The amount of work might then be doubled, and many more books would be read. Scholarship can always be tested by 'unseens,' and there is no particular reason why these should not be done in form. On the whole, 'preparation' in studies does not seem to work well except for boys at the top of the school, as may be seen from *A Day of My Life at Eton*, a work of 'great verisimilitude.'⁸

But as for making boys work, Mr. Portman remarks, 'no public school can do that, or indeed professes to be able to; its powers are limited to giving a splendid education to those who like to take it.'⁹ And yet the best scenes in

¹ *The Hill*, p. 76.

³ *Stalky and Co.*, p. 103.

⁵ *The Hill*, pp. 52, 76.

⁷ *Tom Brown*, p. 269.

⁹ *Hugh Rendal*, p. 137.

² *The Hill*, p. 56.

⁴ *Tom Brown*, p. 216, 268.

⁶ *Hugh Rendal*, p. 173.

⁸ *Upton Letters*, p. 107.

his book describe the Lower Fifth and a mathematical set. In both there was incompetence, in one disorder. He would reply that the teaching was better elsewhere, and we should believe him ; but when we turn to Mr. Gilkes' tales—and Mr. Gilkes is a headmaster—we find that they are largely devoted to a relentless exposure of masters and methods of tuition. *A Day of My Life at Eton* records how a boy passed from aimless playing in school to aimless ragging in his house. He had excellent intentions to work, and little opportunity for doing so.

The intellectual life in our schools is faint, and the intellectual ideals are few. The interest as to work is concentrated on obtaining scholarships. 'Learning, alas!' says Dr. Welldon,¹ 'will some day be smothered by its own children, examination, competition, the calculation and publication of results.' Masters who try to interest boys in pursuits outside the school course, like Hartopp in *Stalky and Co.*, and 'Herbivorous Joe' in *Hugh Rendal*, are turned into ridicule. The naturalist in *Tom Brown* and the poet in *Godfrey Marten* are figures of fun. The model housemaster in Dr. Welldon's story does not approve of Gerald Eversley's literary interests. Masters, indeed, are a duty-loving race. They will take any amount of trouble in coaching a clever boy for a scholarship, or helping a backward one with extra tuition ; but few implant a love of knowledge, not having it themselves. Many become masters because they love games ; the best become masters because they like boys. The men who love knowledge become college dons or take to literature.

All this depresses the author of the *Upton Letters*, and makes us sceptical as to Mr. Portman's 'splendid education.' At the same time, we would rather have athletic masters of the right sort than scholars who were nothing besides. After all, the end of education is not knowledge, but character ; and in some respects at least cricket affords a better discipline than the Greek irregular verbs. The cult of games may be excessive, but games tend to develop the boy morally as well as physically. As played

¹ *Gerald Eversley*, p. 109.

at a public school, they instil a spirit of obedience ; selfishness is discountenanced and combination taught. A boy who has learnt to observe the spirit as well as the letter of the rules, who will follow up and play a losing game to the end, who can keep his temper and accept defeat with a smile, has been fitted for the battle of life.

It is largely through the unconscious discipline of playing that it is found possible to maintain the high level of morality for which (despite all detraction) our public schools are famed. It is true that the morality is apt to be limited to pagan virtues, and taught after a pagan manner.

“Pride in the school, pride in the house, pride in yourself, was what he (Sandyman) meant at the bottom of it all ; and it seems to me a fellow won't go far wrong if he learns the right sort of pride.”¹

That is the moral of *Godfrey Marten*, and we believe his expectation to be justified. The devil will not be over-anxious to tempt those so grounded in his darling sin.

‘A fellow who's going to run straight will always run straight without all that (pi talk and fuss) ; and a fellow who isn't won't be much affected by it either way. A white man's a white man all over the world, whatever he believes, and a rotter's a rotter. The main thing is to buck up all round and depend upon yourself, and not care a hang what anyone thinks of you.’²

The *rotter* will gain but little consolation from such a creed. Are there not *rotters*, conscious of their rottenness, who try and fail and long for a way of escape ? Neither can such a creed be good for the *white man*. He takes his whiteness too much for granted. No ! This is the modern gospel for the production of prigs ! For what is a prig but one who is conscious of his own excellence and satisfied with it ?

Arthur in *Tom Brown* was not a prig, though Slogger Williams called him one. He was a brave but timid boy trying to obey his conscience. He was reticent about his deeper feelings ; and it is not until his illness that he summons sufficient courage to expostulate with Tom on the subject

¹ *Godfrey Marten*, p. 277.

² *Hugh Rendal*, p. 124.

of cribbing. He could not be arrogant in his superiority, for he was a Christian. Austen, in *Schoolboy Honour*, would be called by many a prig. He was a convert of Mr. Holford's, and converts are in an awkward position with regard to their old associates. Boys, too, who fall under the influence of a masterful personality are apt to appear priggish, because they have adopted a standard at second hand, and are somewhat self-conscious in their efforts to live up to it. Whether the dominance of Dr. Arnold or the Socratic irony of Mr. Gilkes be better for training boys would be an interesting subject for discussion; but the 'earnest' pupil of Arnold was improperly called a prig. Lowden, however, is a typical prig.¹ He has his little code all nicely defined. He is satisfied with it and with himself. He does not 'care a hang' what anyone thinks; and he has neither sympathy nor tolerance for their point of view. He is strong, and despises the weak. He does his duty and condemns the irresponsible. He decides on what is fitting for his self-esteem and knows no other standard of reference.

But Christianity came into the world with a new ideal. It taught men to be ever dissatisfied with themselves and to despise no one. It denounced the self-centred pride of the pagan and called men to gaze on the Perfect Example. It did not tell the weak and wretched to despair, but offered means of grace for their assistance. Christians, however they may explain the Atonement, believe that the Death on the Cross was not without its purpose.

Why do men refuse the Gospel and go back to the Law? It is retrogressive to substitute a moral code for a religious creed; and it is retrogressive to extol pagan rectitude above Christian fellowship and charity. But religion is hardly taught in many public schools; and boys connect it only with *pi-jaws*. They don't like them, nor do we for that matter; and they are not good for them unless they be very short and pat to the occasion. And yet Mr. Gurney's method of preparing boys for confirmation commends itself to Mr. Portman. 'With as little mention of religion as possible, he spoke as friend to

¹ *Hugh Rendal.*

friend. . . . He said, "Do the right thing because it is the right thing." Had he ever read St. Paul as to the difficulty of this? Had he no mission to declare whence the help might come?

The author of the *Upton Letters* makes the same complaint as to school sermons. They take the form of long exhortations, or are dry moral essays. Why should not the great verities of the Faith be proclaimed, and the lives of saints and heroes told? Why should not boys be taught to worship and have the meaning of their prayers and services explained? We are apt to forget that the great language of Cranmer is no longer the vulgar tongue. It is not spoken colloquially by modern schoolboys.

In conclusion, we should not be wrong if we summed up the ideal presented in these school tales in the words of Mr. Newbolt's song:

'Play up, play up, and play the game.'

It is excellent so far as it goes, but it is always well to know the game you are going to play and its rules. At school this is decided for you. The games and work are alike compulsory. But it is sad how lacking most boys are in any sense of vocation. They are active, intelligent, and industrious when any work is placed before them, but they are without any object in life, and without any consciousness that life should have one. Is that the reason why public-school boys are excellent subalterns, but bad leaders?

Whether ambition should be encouraged is discussed in the *Upton Letters*. We think not, but we are sure that all boys should be taught that they were put into the world for a purpose, that it is their duty to make the most of every faculty, and that they will have to give an account of their works.

ART. VI.—RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN CRETE AND
THEIR BEARING ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF
THE ÆGEAN.

1. *Annual of the British School at Athens*.¹
2. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.¹ Published by the Council of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies and sold on their behalf by Macmillan and Co.
3. *Monumenti Antichi dei Lincei*.¹

SINCE the famous telegram in which Schliemann informed the King of the Hellenes that he had discovered the tomb of Agamemnon, there has been nothing in archæology which has made such a vivid impression on the popular imagination as Mr. Arthur Evans' excavations at Knossos. The Minotaur! the Labyrinth!—such words do not suggest the solemnities of antiquarian research. The average fairly equipped scholar knows that the French have explored Delos and Delphi; but, unless he is working at archæology, he does not know what they have found there. The work of the British School at Megalopolis and in Melos is familiar only to the more painstaking members of the Hellenic Society. Knossos alone appeals to no mere esoteric audience of specialists. It moves along the broad ways, and carries us back, behind our learning and education, to the glamour and romance of our first fairy stories. Nor is the impression solely due to the nature of the material. It is largely due to Mr. Evans himself. It is not only that he has the gift of clear and attractive writing, or that he tries consciously to interest a wide public in work which must necessarily involve large expense. It is that Mr. Evans naturally does not see things in a dry light. He has the dramatic instinct, and impresses it on all he touches. What could be more dramatic than the photograph which he printed as the frontispiece of the first report of the Cretan Exploration Fund? ² The excavation of the Throne Room is in process;

¹ Throughout the article these periodicals are referred to as *B. S. A.*, *J. H. S.*, and *Mon. Ant.* respectively.

² The photograph can now be obtained as a lantern slide from

in the foreground four peasants are bending at their work ; at the back are the plank ways and the baskets of dug-out earth, and all the apparatus of exploration ; and there, in the centre of the picture, with its carved back a bare three feet below the surface of the soil, is the throne of the ancient king, with the lines of its strange crocketing fresh and unchipped, not an inch moved from the day when first it was packed away in the earth five-and-thirty centuries ago.

Take, again, one of Mr. Evans' own descriptions in that first fascinating article in the *Monthly Review* for March 1901. He had just discovered the fresco of the 'Cup-bearer.'¹

'The colours were almost as brilliant as when laid down over three thousand years before. For the first time the true portraiture of a man of this mysterious Mycenæan race rises before us. There was something very impressive in this vision of brilliant youth and of male beauty, recalled after so long an interval to our upper air from what had been till yesterday a forgotten world. Even our untutored Cretan workmen felt the spell and fascination.

'They, indeed, regarded the discovery of such a painting in the bosom of the earth as nothing less than miraculous, and saw in it the "icon" of a saint ! The removal of the fresco required a delicate and laborious process of under-plastering, which necessitated its being watched at night, and old Manolis, one of the most trustworthy of our gang, was told off for the purpose. Somehow or other he fell asleep, but the wrathful saint appeared to him in a dream. Waking with a start he was conscious of a mysterious presence ; the animals round began to low and neigh, and there were visions about ; "φαντάζει," he said, in summing up his experiences next morning, "The whole place spooks !"'

The finds of that first season's work were indeed marvellous. Besides the Throne² and the Cupbearer, there were the long corridors with their Aladdin's jars,³ the miniature

the loan collection of the Hellenic Society. It makes a stimulating introduction to a lantern lecture on recent discovery in Greece.

¹ Fig. 6, p. 124.

² *Monthly Review*, March 1901, fig. 5, p. 123.

³ *Ibid.* fig. 2, p. 118.

frescoes of 'Parisiennes' watching the Palace sports,¹ the life-size Bull's Head in hard coloured plaster,² the fresco fragment of the boy gathering white crocuses, all found during the early months of 1900. Above all, the great hoard of clay tablets in the unknown script³ gave a sensational promise of revelations to come. For beauty and picturesqueness and sheer thrill these discoveries remain unmatched by those of any subsequent year. None the less, no one, not even Mr. Evans himself, ever expected that so much was to follow. In the first report he talked of the work as 'barely half completed'; but, in fact, it has gone on for five more years, and there is still much to be done. Only this last year the paved way leading from the Theatral Area has been found to connect the Palace with a 'Little Palace,' running at a considerable depth of earth into the hillside opposite. The excavation of this important building has only just been begun, and may lead to far-reaching results.⁴ The great Palace itself, as now excavated, is a vast complex of chambers, courts, and corridors, bewildering to the lay mind as laid out in the plans prepared by Mr. Evans' architects, and hard to find one's way through even on the spot. From the architectural point of view the elaborate staircases,⁵ the drainage system,⁶ the 'theatral area' on one side of the Palace,⁷ and the 'basilica' in the hall of the Royal Villa on the other,⁸ are all of the first importance. Hard plaster work is represented by the male torso with the *fleur-de-lis* collar,⁹ and the forearm holding a pointed vase,¹⁰ where the muscles in particular are rendered with great power. Of the frescoes the most remarkable is the bust of a girl in a high-bodied dress discovered in 1901,¹¹ and the almost life-size figure of a girl dancing in

¹ *J. H. S.*, xxi. 1901, plate V.

² *Monthly Review*, March 1901, fig. 7, p. 126, unaccountably skied on the walls of the Candia Museum.

³ *Ibid.* fig. 8, p. 128.

⁴ See Mr. Evans' Preliminary Report in the *Times*, Oct. 31, 1905.

⁵ *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, figs. 1, p. 2, 23, p. 47, 44, p. 79.

⁶ *Ibid.*, figs. 7, p. 13, and 46 to 48, pp. 82-85.

⁷ *Ibid.* ix. 1902-3, fig. 69, p. 105.

⁸ *Ibid.*, fig. 89, p. 145.

⁹ *Ibid.* vii. 1900-1901, fig. 6, p. 17.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, fig. 29, p. 89.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, fig. 17, p. 57.

jacket and chemise,¹ found during the following year. Interesting, also, are the fragments of a male figure, the centre of whose lily crown was ornamented with peacocks' plumes.² Apart from this wall decoration there is not only a profusion of vase types, a phenomenon one has been led to expect on all Mediterranean sites, but examples of other more distinctive kinds of artistic work. The royal draught-board defies description, with its blaze of gold and silver, ivory and crystal and kuanos.³ The fabric of porcelain was found by 1903 to be of the most extensive and varied character. Some plaques represented a mosaic of a city with towers and three-storied windowed houses,⁴ others warriors or hunters,⁵ and others again, as plausibly reconstructed from isolated fragments, nature scenes, such as flying-fish in a border of rocks and sea shells.⁶ More perfect than all in design and technique is the relief of a goat suckling her young,⁷ characterized, as it is, not only by naturalism, but also, as Mr. Evans claims, 'by a certain ideal dignity and balance.' The surface colour is here a pale green with dark sepia markings. Among porcelain vases one may specially note a two-handled bowl with cockle-shell reliefs, and a pale-green vase with fern spray decoration and a spray of rose-leaves springing in relief from the top of the handle, and spreading over part of the inner margin of the cup.⁸

The technique of the Minoan craftsman in ivory was no less perfect than in porcelain, though less widely represented in the excavations. In one case it has been possible to reconstitute the whole figure of a boy, about eleven and a half inches high. He is in the act of jumping, with head gracefully thrown back, and arms and legs outstretched. Not only are the muscles faithfully rendered,

¹ *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, fig. 28, p. 55.

² These fragments have now been put together by M. Gilliéron and from them the whole figure has been restored. The reconstruction is not so convincing as most of his work.

³ *B. S. A.*, vii. 1900-1, fig. 25, p. 79.

⁴ *Ibid.*, viii. 1901-2, figs. 8 and 9, pp. 15-17.

⁵ *Ibid.*, fig. 10, p. 21.

⁶ *Ibid.*, ix. 1902-3, fig. 46, p. 69.

⁷ *Ibid.*, plate III.

⁸ *Ibid.*, figs. 51, 53a, 53b, pp. 73, 74.

but even the veins on the back of the hand, and the finger-nails¹; while the hair is represented by curling bronze wire plated with gold. Such figures, as Mr. Evans suggests, were probably hung from the girdle by fine gold chains, and are meant to suggest the toreadors of the palace bull-hunts which loom so large in the art and the traditions of Knossos. We can imagine the associations which the wearing of such ivories would suggest to the ladies of the court when we look at such a scene as that painted on one of the frescoes of the palace walls. A girl in what Mr. Evans calls 'cowboy' costume is in the act of being tossed by a charging bull; a boy is turning head-over-heels over the animal's back; while a girl behind is holding out both hands to catch him in his fall.

The closer, indeed, that one looks into the excavations at Knossos, the less wonder is there that they have needed six seasons' work. To understand them fully we must visit Candia—easy of access from Athens, even if we hit upon no special pilgrimage—and see in its now famous museum the care and skill with which frescoes and vases and porcelains and ivories have been pieced together and set and restored. We must walk out, too, the few miles that separate Knossos from the sea, and pass through the chain of hills hiding the low knoll upon which it stands—the protecting hills that made its first stone-age citizens choose it as the nearest point up the river from the broad shallow harbour of Katzavas which was safe from the wandering pirate. We only then realize how extraordinarily well Mr. Evans does things. It is not only the luncheon he gives us under the olive trees, with the red wine from Mount Ida, and the droning bagpipe tune of the peasants' mandolins, and the ring dance, reminiscent in its rhythmical bend of arm and clap of hand and knee of our own Highland reels, but tracing, as excavations tell us,² its own native Cretan pedigree back to the ritual of Minoan times. The absence of the 'dry light,' which we notice as readers and as guests,

¹ *B.S.A.* viii. 1901-2, fig. 39, p. 74, and plates II. and III.

² See *B. S. A.*, x. 1903-4, p. 217, where Mr. R. M. Dawkins describes some figurines discovered by the British School at Palai-

is even more noticeable in the way in which Mr. Evans treats his excavations. He is not content to leave them clean and well ordered, though the disgracefully untidy state in which the French have left Delos shews that even so much is not to be expected of all explorers. He has made it his object not only to unearth and preserve, but wherever possible to restore and reproduce the original effect. He has in him something of the spirit of Viollet-le-Duc, though chastened by scientific method. The work of keeping in position staircases and supporting upper floor levels has in itself been a huge one, and no expense has been spared to make it perfect. Even on the ground level much had to be done and a quotation from his report for 1901 well illustrates Mr. Evans' method.¹

'Of the works of conservation undertaken, the most important was the enclosing and roofing in of the Throne Room—a work rendered urgent by the effect which exposure to the weather was already beginning to produce both on the Throne itself and the seats and parapet. In order to support the roof it was necessary to place some kind of pillars in the position formerly occupied by the Mycenæan columns, the burnt remains of which were found fixed in the sockets of the stone bench opposite the Throne. This necessity and the desire to avoid the introduction of any incongruous elements amid such surroundings determined me to reproduce the form of the original Mycenæan columns. An exact model both for the shape and colouring was happily at hand in the small fresco of the temple façade, and the work was successfully executed under Mr. Fyfe's superintendence. In order to protect the room from wanton damage, we were further reluctantly obliged to place a substantial iron railing and door across the entrance. For this, unfortunately, no Knossian model was forthcoming, and the best that could be done was to get a native smith of Candia to make a scroll-work of wrought-iron of the kind that is usual here to place before Mahometan shrines, the spiral designs of which, at least, are curiously in harmony with Mycenæan patterns. About the

kastro, where three votaries are dancing hand in hand round a snake goddess. See also Mr. Evans' remarks in *B. S. A.*, ix. pp. 111, 112.

¹ *B. S. A.*, vii. 1900-1, p. 2.

middle of the opening in order to give support to this barrier a stone pillar was set up in a socket of the pavement where a wooden one had stood.¹

We have spoken above of a visit to the Candia Museum as necessary to a full understanding of the glories of Knossos. If, however, such a visit were made with the expectation of seeing Knossos, and nothing but Knossos, the visitor would receive a shock. Various as they are, Mr. Evans' finds fill barely half the room. Though no single site can claim to rival Knossos, their cumulative effect is almost as remarkable. It is not merely that isolated deposits have been found at many points, such as the double axes of the birth-cave of Zeus in the side of Mount Dicte, the remarkable early pottery which will henceforward, wherever found, record its first discovery in the Kamáres cave on the southern slopes of Mount Ida, or the gems which came from Hagios Onuphrios further south. At Gournia, in a sheltered bay on the northern coast, east of Mount Dicte, Miss A. H. Boyd has unearthed a whole city of the Minoan epoch, and we can pass up to its palace on the hill through street after street of the houses of the people, treading the old narrow roadway of flagged stones, as it winds through them like the Sacred Way at Delphi or at Rome.

Similar work has been done by the British School at Palai-kastro on the eastern coast. Above all, at Phæstos in the centre of the southern coast, barely ten miles from Gortyna, Professor Halbherr and the Italian mission have excavated a palace which from the architectural point of view is as magnificent as that of Knossos itself¹; while a smaller building on the neighbouring hill of Hagia Triada, the country villa of the kings of Phæstos, has yielded a number of objects, as yet little known in England, which are of great beauty and significance. The fresco on which a cat is trying to catch a bird, recalls the well-known dagger blade from the fifth grave at Mycenæ, in which cat-like animals hunt wild ducks in a river marsh; but the size of the fresco

¹ See *Mon. Ant.*, xii. 1902, plates III. to VII.; xiv. 1905, plates XXVII. to XXXIII. and figs. 1-44.

is much larger, the cat being twelve inches, the bird four inches high. A painted sarcophagus gives us in greater detail than we have ever had before a scene of primitive worship. On one side is a sacrificial procession; on the other is a bull bound on a table for sacrifice, with its blood pouring into a vessel; above is a figure playing a flute, below are other animals ready to be sacrificed in their turn. Most remarkable from the artistic point of view are three vases of black steatite, or soapstone, equalling, and indeed surpassing, the famous Vaphio cups in design and skill of execution. If, as has been for several reasons plausibly suggested, they were originally coated with gold leaf,¹ these stone carvings must have borne a curious resemblance to the goldsmith's work which has hitherto been regarded as the greatest achievement of Mycenæan civilization. It is not unnatural that the view is now widely accepted that the bull-hunting cups of Vaphio were an importation to the mainland from Cretan workshops. The smallest of these black vases, only four inches high, represents a group of warriors, some of them in line of battle, with only head and feet shewing above and below a line of tall tower-like shields locked close together; two of them, the chieftains, standing apart, one holding a lance, the other a long sword. The ideal grace and dignity of these two helmeted figures, the pose with which the one holding the sword throws head and body back, is beyond any representation of the human figure hitherto known before the best period of Archaic Hellenic art; the fresco of the Cupbearer is the only thing which comes anywhere near it; with other human figures, even from Knossos, it has little in common except the narrow Mycenæan waist. The other two vases lack this idealism, though in technique and breadth of conception they are unsurpassed. One, the tallest of the three, has its eighteen inches of height decorated by designs placed one above the other in four separate zones. The topmost of these is a battle scene, the second a bull-hunt closely resembling those on the Vaphio cups; the third and fourth describe what can only be called a kind of gladiatorial show.

¹ See *J. H. S.*, xxiv. 1904, p. 320.

Helmeted boxers are here seen in every attitude, some victorious, with the left arm held out for parrying, and the right drawn back to strike, others prostrate on the ground, with their feet kicking up in the air; there are traces of some kind of boxing-glove or cestus. It is interesting to notice that boxers in an identical attitude are to be seen on the fragments of a steatite pyxis found at Knossos in 1901,¹ and a clay seal impression also found there in 1903²; on the latter there is also behind the boxer a column with a rectangular capital such as occurs in the designs just described. Pugilism was clearly one of the Minoan sports as well as bull-baiting.

One is tempted to suggest, too, that the tradition of some such vase found its way to the makers of the bronze jars of Bologna and the head of the Adriatic.³ Two of the distinguishing features of that remarkable group of bronze vessels, all obviously of the same school, are, first, their scheme of depicting various scenes from daily life in two, three, or four superimposed zones, and secondly, the prominent part played in these scenes by groups of contending boxers.⁴ It need scarcely be added that in the

¹ *B. S. A.*, vii. 1900-1, fig. 31, p. 95.

² *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, fig. 35, p. 56.

³ We should expect Mr. Evans to accept this suggestion, as already in 1890 (*Archæologia*, lii. p. 335), when tracing the influence exercised by these situlæ in their turn on Celtic art as we find it in the zoned urns of Aylesford, Kent, he incidentally noticed in them 'Greek and Phœnician' elements. In one point the situlæ represent an earlier tradition than the actual Hagia Triada vase. Zone decoration must have begun in bronze technique, vessels being formed of metal bands riveted together. One may suggest that when the superior splendour of gold was recognized, as seen for instance in the Vaphio cups, its effect was obtained for larger vessels by the device of steatite covered with gold leaf.

⁴ See *Gli Scavi della Certosa di Bologna*, Zannoni, 1876, plate XXXV., figs. 6, 7, and CXLIX., fig. 8. The reader should be warned that fig. 62 on the former plate and fig. 2 on the latter are not from Bologna at all, but from Matrei in the Tyrol and Waatsch in Carniola respectively. See Hoernes, *Urgeschichte der Kunst in Europa*, 1898, plate XXXV., figs. 2, 5, 6. For another example of precisely the same style from Kuffarn in Lower Austria see Hoernes, plate XXXIII. Zannoni is careless and misleading

type of human figure which he represents and in the skill with which he depicts it the 'Italo-Illyrian' artist is much coarser than the Minoan.

The third of the steatite vases, midway in size between the other two, represents one single scene, and that with such masterly naturalism that it seems irony that we cannot agree as to what it means.¹ A body of men are marching in some kind of triumphal procession; leading them is an elderly man of importance with a physiognomy as distinctive as those of the gold masks from the graves of Mycenæ; in the middle are four persons—one, perhaps a priest, playing an instrument like a sistrum, the other three, perhaps women, shouting in chorus with open mouths. So much is clear. The difficulty comes when we try to interpret the curious garment worn by the elderly leader, and the still more curious implements carried by him and his followers. On one theory the scene represents a harvest feast; on the other a triumph after a naval victory. The former sees in the scale-like object on the leader's back a ceremonial cope with the markings of fur or skin or wicker work, the latter a coat of chain armour; the one regards the long three-pronged forks from the obvious point of view as agricultural implements, and the short cross-bar lashed to them at a right angle just below the prongs as also serving some function in rick-making; the other sees in them a composite naval weapon in which the crossbar was used for grappling, and the fork as a bayonet.²

in figuring these illustrative mid-European jars on his own plates under the general heading 'Sepolchro 68' &c., without even giving a note referring to the passages in his accompanying volume of text where their provenance is described.

¹ An excellent plaster copy of this vase can be obtained from the authorities of the Candia Museum for six francs. See also *Mon. Ant.*, xiii. 1903, figs. 2, 3, 4, pp. 85, 86. The other objects described have not yet been published by the Italian excavators, a delay which contrasts unfavourably with Mr. Evans' promptness.

² Such as the *δορυδρέπανον* mentioned in the *Laches*, or the Roman *falx muralis*. L. Savignoni, in *Mon. Ant.*, xiii., compares also the trident of the retiarii and the *ἔγχεα ἀμφίγυρα*, of *Iliad* xv. 711. The farmer's stick is, according to him, a *κοιτὴς* or *ξύστρον*. See the battle by the ships in *Iliad* xv. 384, 676-7, 730, 742.

This mass of discoveries on Cretan sites has not only made the Candia Museum one of the most important in the world, but has also immensely complicated the archaeological situation. The position created by Mr. Evans' first excavations at Knossos was simple and comfortable. The word Mycenæan was still used of everything which came between the Neolithic age and the beginnings of classical Greece. Within this vast period an evolution had, of course, been recognized, and Earlier and Later Mycenæan were terms commonly in use. A glance, however, at a book such as the first volume of Professor Ridgeway's *Early Age of Greece*, published in 1901, will shew how vague such distinctions were, and to what a large extent Mycenæan civilization was still regarded as an indivisible whole. In this civilization Crete was found without surprise to have played the leading part which tradition had always claimed for it. The closest determination of date which we seemed likely to secure was that the mature bloom of the art of Knossos was an earlier stage than that represented in the lower town of Mycenæ, and practically contemporary with that of the fourth shaft grave on its acropolis. The simplicity and the danger of such 'thinking in millenniums' is well illustrated by Professor Ridgeway's book itself. The impression left on the reader is that between the Neolithic age and the Geometric there was just time enough for the Pelasgians to be overthrown by the Achæans. Learned and original as the writer is, he never faces the question whether the facts at his disposal are at all likely to be sufficient to account for the events of two or three thousand years. We have the uncomfortable feeling that a similar way of dealing with a similar amount of knowledge might have given us the conquest of Britons by Saxons as a full and adequate account of the thousand years in the history of our own island which precede the Norman invasion. Mr. Evans himself, and, indeed, his immediate fellow workers, never fell into this error; we find them from the first feeling tentatively after a closer determination of date. Such dating, modified as it has inevitably been by the yearly progress of discovery, makes the reading of Mr. Evans'

earlier reports dangerous work, and even his present conclusions¹ must not in every detail be accepted as his final ones. Before discussing their soundness or the problems they suggest, it may be well briefly to describe them. We notice first and foremost that Mr. Evans has banished the word Mycenæan as a generic description of the early civilization of Crete, and has substituted for it the word Minoan. The reason is not far to seek. Between the Neolithic age and the Geometric he has found himself able to distinguish nine epochs; and it is only in the seventh that the earliest of the remains found at Mycenæ itself can be said to begin; while it is only the ninth which is coincident with the widest diffusion of what has hitherto been known as Mycenæan culture. The change of nomenclature is amply justified, but the transitional state in which it leaves the term Mycenæan, used sometimes in its old generic and sometimes in its new specific sense, will for a long time to come lead to much confusion.

The first of the nine epochs thus designated as Minoan immediately succeeds the Neolithic age. Its black-surfaced hand-polished vases with their primitive geometric decoration resemble the non-Egyptian vases found by Professor Flinders Petrie in First Dynasty tombs at Abydos.² A syenite vase and liparite and diorite cups found at Knossos³ are in their turn probably importations from Egypt, and belong to a period at least as early as the Fourth Dynasty. On Cretan seals, too, can be traced the influence of the art of the first group of dynasties. In regard to the date of the

¹ As given, for instance, in a Paper read before the Archaeological Congress at Athens April 10, 1905, and in a letter to the *Times* newspaper, Oct. 31, 1905.

² *B. S. A.*, x. 1903-4, fig. 8, p. 24. It should be noted that we find these Geometric vases both before and after the great artistic periods. The tradition may have lingered on all the time among the humbler part of the population. Similarly we have rough polygonal or Cyclopean building both before and after the fine Minoan work. Cf. *Mon. Ant.*, xiv. 1905, fig. 40, p. 414, with *ibid.*, fig. 15, p. 353.

³ *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, fig. 67 *a* and *b*, p. 98, and viii. 1901-2, figs. 72, 74, pp. 121, 123.

First Dynasty, Egyptologists still differ widely, Petrie placing it at 4777 B.C., Budge (following Brugsch) at 4400, Lepsius at 3892, and E. Meyer at 3315. Mr. Evans provisionally accepts Lepsius' figure, and assigns this first epoch to about that date. As its deposit reaches to a depth of 5·33 mètres from the surface, he is thus allowing rather less than 1000 years for each mètre. It should be noticed that on the same principle we get a great age for the Neolithic deposit which underlies it, at one testing point to a depth of 6·43, and at another to a depth of 8 mètres. Mr. Evans, however, does not shrink from the dates of 10,000, or 12,000 B.C., which are thus given to the first settlement of man on the hill at Knossos.

Above the white or black hand-polished vases, with their brown or white geometric decoration, of this sub-Neolithic stratum which Mr. Evans calls Early Minoan I. comes a slightly more advanced stage, in which primitive idols of marble or ivory and spiral decoration on seals and vases first make their appearance. This Early Minoan II. is in its turn followed by Early Minoan III., in which geometric and spiral ornaments are found in a developed form, and polychrome vases, which are to be such a marked and distinguishing feature of Cretan art, first begin. The seals of this period are marked with primitive pictographs, and some of them shew the influence of the so-called button seals of the Sixth Egyptian Dynasty, placed by Petrie and Budge in the latter half of the Fourth Millennium B.C. The so-called Cycladic culture, such as we find at Amorgos and in the first settlement at Phylakopi in Melos, probably began immediately after Neolithic times, but it is in this period that it first comes into contact with Crete. The second or 'burnt' city of Troy is also to be placed at this epoch.

So far we have got only a short way beyond barbarous art. The beginnings of polychrome decoration and pictographic signs alone place Crete above the neighbouring Aegean settlements. It is in the next period, Middle Minoan I., that the great advance is made. The remarkable clay figurines of female figures found by Mr. J. L.

Myres on the peak of Petsofá, above Palaikastro, with their open corsage, wide standing collars, high shoe-horn hats, and elaborate crinolines, have the ground colour of their clay painted over with a colour scheme of black and white, red and orange.¹ At Knossos, too, side by side with monochrome vases with their design painted in lustrous black varnish on a buff clay slip, we find lustreless polychrome decoration in white, yellow, orange, red, and crimson, on a lustrous black varnish ground. The pictographic seals shew a corresponding advance.

It is possible that in this period are to be placed the beginnings of the first palaces of Knossos and of Phaistos. They were certainly built by the time of the next period, Middle Minoan II. Vases now shew the polychrome style predominant, and monochrome decoration is only used for common ware. Middle Minoan II. is the period of Kamáres ware in its most highly developed form, and the graceful designs, egg-shell fabric, and delicate colouring of its bowls and 'tea-cups'² take us clear away from the region of what is merely primitive or curious, and shew us what in any age would be considered beautiful. This fact adds a special interest to the controversy which is still raging as to the date of the Twelfth Egyptian Dynasty, with which the evidence connects this period. The traditional dating, followed by Mr. Evans, and, in some form or other, by most English Egyptologists, connects this dynasty with the centuries immediately surrounding B.C. 2500,³ and, according to this, the length of time during which Minoan art produced things of beauty reaches the startling figure of 1000 years. Mr. Evans believes that, so far as the Cretan evidence goes, this is not a century too much to account for its development. Many of the younger German Egyptologists, however, such as Erman and Borchardt,

¹ *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, plate VIII.

² *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, figs. 70 and 71, p. 120. See also the beautiful reproductions in colour in *J. H. S.*, xxiii. plates V. and VI.

³ Petrie (*Hist.*, i. p. 147) gives 2778 to 2565 for the Twelfth Dynasty, Budge (*Hist.*, iii. p. 2) the slightly later date of 2466 to 2300.

and historians of early civilization such as Eduard Meyer, partly from a new interpretation of the dating contained in a Twelfth Dynasty Temple Book, partly from *a priori* considerations of the length of time necessary for the whole Middle Kingdom and Hyksos period, argue for a date later by six or seven hundred years. This theory would not touch the well-authenticated date of the Eighteenth Dynasty, which would still begin at about B.C. 1600; it would merely pack very much closer all that intervenes between it and the Twelfth, and thus significantly reduce the period of the bloom of Minoan art. On the other hand, although at first sight it seems as if, on this theory, the dates of the First and following dynasties must necessarily be moved later by the same six or seven centuries,¹ the margin of uncertainty is in their case so great that we cannot assume that this will be done by every Egyptologist. A writer who was previously content to accept the year 3892 of Lepsius might now lean to the 4400 of Budge, or the 4777 of Petrie, and deduct the 600 or 700 years from the latter and not the former. It should be noticed in this connexion that the relations which Mr. Evans has sought to establish between his Early Minoan I. and the earliest dynasties are considered by some Egyptologists to be not yet proven. If, as is not impossible, the German dating for the Twelfth Dynasty wins the day, Mr. Evans has three courses open to him. He may prefer to shake his Early Minoan I. free from its Egyptian associations, and leave it on its own merits at its earlier date, while at the same time accepting for the First Dynasty a date nearer B.C. 3000 than 4000; or he may bring both Cretan and Egyptian dating forward together; or finally, he may keep them both back to the same date as before by allowing, with Budge and Petrie,

¹ E. Meyer does so, placing the First Dynasty, as already mentioned, at 3315 and the Sixth at 2540 B.C. Such dates, however, do not necessarily follow from his interpretation of the Twelfth Dynasty Kahun Temple Book, but are chiefly based upon his reconstruction of the Turin Papyrus. His date for the Twelfth Dynasty is 2000-1788 B.C., and he begins the Eighteenth in 1580 B.C. (See *Abhandlungen der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1904.)

greater space to the dynasties which immediately follow them.

At the end of the period just described there are traces at Knossos of a general catastrophe, and from the period which follows it, Middle Minoan III., date the beginnings of the Palace as we now see it. The lower part of an Egyptian seated figure of diorite, bearing a hieroglyphic inscription, found in the earlier stratum of the central court,¹ connects its beginnings with the Thirteenth Dynasty, while the lid of an alabastron with the cartouche of the Hyksos King Khyan shews that it probably did not close before the Fifteenth.² Hieroglyphic writing is seen in its perfection, and the first kind of linear signs, called by Mr. Evans Class A, are just beginning. Polychrome decoration is passing out of fashion; the best vases have a white design on a lilac or mauve ground.³ The fresco of a boy gathering white crocuses and placing them in a vase, though imperfect in its treatment of the human figure, shews a delicacy and refinement of idea that we do not expect in a civilization which we are accustomed to regard as still young and undeveloped. The hoard of fine porcelain already described belongs to the same period.

The next period, Late Minoan I., is introduced by an

¹ We have here a good illustration of the pitfalls which must necessarily beset Mr. Evans' readers till he is able to publish his book dealing with the excavations as a whole. In discussing his latest classification of epochs he only talks of 'The Egyptian monument of the Thirteenth Dynasty found in the palace of Knossos.' A search in the Annual Reports shews us that he is referring to this diorite figure, which, where first described, is said to have been discovered in 'the great Eastern Court.' In the latter plans, however, such a name does not exist. Subsequent excavations have placed it in the very centre of the Palace.

² *B. S. A.*, vii. 1900-1, fig. 21, p. 65. Mr. H. R. Hall, in an interesting article just published, *J. H. S.*, xxv. 1905, pp. 331-337, has suggested that its architecture may have been influenced by the buildings of the Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasties, perhaps by the Temple of Hawara itself, the 'Egyptian Labyrinth.'

³ *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, fig. 51, 7 and 10, p. 91 = *J. H. S.*, xxiii. fig. 8, 7 and 10, p. 189, and also *B. S. A.*, x. 1903-4, fig. 1, p. 7, and fig. 2, p. 9.

extensive re-modelling of the Palace.¹ It is the period of many of the *chefs-d'œuvre* of Minoan art already described. The villa of Hagia Triada, with its steatite vases, cat and bird fresco, and sarcophagus with the sacrificial procession, is to be placed here. So probably is the royal draught-board of the palace of Knossos. The linear writing of Class A is now in regular use. Bronze swords have succeeded the daggers whose blades have been gradually lengthening during the Middle Minoan period. The most characteristic vases have brown, white, and red decorations on a yellowish or whitish ground.² The latest elements in the second city of Phylakopi are contemporary, and the shaft graves at Mycenæ begin in this period, and stretch on into the next. In relation to Egyptian history, Late Minoan I. may be taken as covering the last part of the Hyksos occupation, and closing about the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

It is with the early years of this Eighteenth Dynasty that the next period, Late Minoan II., is certainly contemporary. The resemblances between the frescoes and the vases of the mature Palace style and the processions of Keftians on the tombs of Sen-Mut and Rekhmarā at Thebes would be themselves sufficient to establish a close connexion. We are here happily beyond the reach of the controversy on the chronology of the Middle Kingdom which obscures the dating of the preceding periods. The reigns of Queen Hatshepsut and King Thothmes III., to which these tombs belong, cannot have begun much earlier than 1550 nor much later than 1500 B.C.³ This, then, is the

¹ This is apparently what Mr. Evans alludes to in *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, p. 45, when he speaks of 'the first great catastrophe of the Later Palace.'

² *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, fig. 51, 3, p. 91 = *J. H. S.*, xxiii. fig. 8, 3, p. 189.

³ Petrie, following E. Mahler, places them 1503-1449 B.C., E. Meyer 1501-1447, Budge 1550-1500. Mr. Evans connects the period with the sixteenth rather than the fifteenth century, and would probably prefer for these reigns the still earlier date 1600-1550 as given by Mr. H. R. Hall in *B.S.A.* viii. 1901-2, p. 164. Mahler's or Meyer's views, however, are not necessarily inconsistent with Mr. Evans', since these particular tombs may date from towards the end of the period.

date of the great architectural period of Minoan art—the period of the Throne Room and the Basilica hall of the Royal Villa, the period of the great scheme of fresco wall decoration which survives to us in the Cupbearer and the groups of spectators watching the Palace sports. Even the decoration of the most characteristic vases of this period shews the influence of the architectural spirit, their rosettes and conventional flowers being imitated from the fresco borders and stone friezes of the Palace.¹ The conventional element to be seen in the designs of this 'Palace style' of pottery, as Mr. Evans first called it, marks also contemporary work in stone and bronze. One of the magnificent bronze vessels has a special interest in bearing a close resemblance to a metal ewer figured on the Eighteenth Dynasty tomb of Sen-mut, as offered by a narrow-waisted Keftian, himself a faithful likeness of the Knossian 'Cupbearer.'² Scarcely less interesting is the stone amphora which lay unfinished in the sculptor's workshop when the great catastrophe came.³ Naturalism, where it survives in pottery,⁴ borrows its flowers and birds and fishes from the scenes depicted in the frescoes themselves, just as the more conventional style borrows from their decorative framework. It should be noticed that though the decorative instinct which dominates this period shuns naturalistic designs, and can use even miniature fresco scenes in a bizarre fantastic way as elements in a scheme of wall painting, the word conventional cannot be applied to the frescoes as a whole. The painters of the landscape and marine scenes found in the Queen's Megaron,⁵ or of the life-size figure of the Cupbearer, did not allow their art to sink to a level

¹ See *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, fig. 88, p. 139, and *J. H. S.* xxiii. figs. 10 and 10a, pp. 192-3.

² See *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, fig. 76a, and also figs. 76b to 85, pp. 122-129; also *Ibid.*, viii. 1901-2, figs. 2, 3, and 7, pp. 171-173, and x., 1903-4, fig. 1, p. 154.

³ See *ibid.*, vii. 1900-1, fig. 30, p. 91, for a similar stone amphora in a finished state.

⁴ See *ibid.*, ix. fig. 72, p. 117, and vii. 1900-1, p. 51. See also *J. H. S.*, xxiii. fig. 11, p. 195.

⁵ See *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, pp. 58, 59.

where it would merely be subsidiary to the needs of wall decoration ; the objects they represent have a value to them of their own, and their attempt to express nature is sincere and vigorous. The same is true of the sculptors who worked the magnificent series of life-size reliefs in hard plaster which is illustrated by the Bull's Head and the torso of a man. In this its last great era Minoan art was not decadent ; it contained in itself no inherent over-ripeness which, apart from any disturbing influence from the outside, must have meant speedy deterioration. The hoard of clay tablets discovered in the first year of the excavations, and dating from this period, shew that its linear writing, called by Mr. Evans Class B, is more advanced than that of the preceding epoch. It was a civilization which was still growing and developing that was given a sudden and crushing blow by the sack of Knossos.

The full extent and meaning of the change in the Ægean world which is illustrated for us by the burnt beams and charred wooden columns of the corridors of Knossos must be discussed later. For the moment it is enough to say that the last of Mr. Evans' nine epochs which it introduces, Late Minoan III., is that which has hitherto been most closely associated with the word Mycenæan. Beginning as it does soon after 1500 B.C., it certainly does not close till the end of the Twentieth Dynasty in 1100, and perhaps stretches on another century into the Twenty-first.¹ Within it fall the pottery of Ialysos, and the objects found in the lower town of Mycenæ. If ever we secure a site continuously inhabited throughout it, and admitting of stratification by successive floor levels, we shall find that it will break up into as many subdivisions as those eras which a few years ago we should have had to class together as Pre- or Early Mycenæan. Its earlier phases are represented by a cemetery on the hill of Zafer Papoura, about a mile north of the palace of Knossos. The contents of the one hundred tombs which have been excavated have not yet been fully published ; but a preliminary report is enough to shew that the art which they represent would not

¹ See later, p. 409, note 1.

of itself suggest a violent catastrophe. Degeneration has set in, and proceeds steadily and without a break; but it is gradual, and if we had not the facts of Minoan history so fully before us, we could, perhaps, never have told that it had begun, certainly not have guessed the moment at which the first impetus was given to it. Mr. Evans tells us of bronze swords nearly a mètre long, of a shorter sword with a gold-plated handle engraved with a masterly design of lions hunting wild goats, of false-necked or 'stirrup' vases with magnificent decorative designs. The discovery in their company of a scarab of the late Eighteenth Dynasty reminds us of the Egyptian objects of a similar date already so closely associated with the houses and lower city tombs of Mycenæ.

It will be noticed that even in this earliest phase of degeneration new types cease to be invented; technical skill lingers on and dies hard, but inspiration has already gone. Even the false-necked vase, though it reaches its widest diffusion at this epoch, is a type found existing in much earlier strata.¹ Technique itself soon begins gradually to degenerate; the designs of the last great creative epoch are imitated with less and less fidelity. The naturalistic flowers and birds and fishes which, as we have noticed, it had borrowed from contemporary fresco scenes, are now rendered in a slovenly shorthand method²; beautiful shells, as Mr. Evans puts it, have become corkscrews. At the same time the parallel architectonic style fades away into occasional groups of horizontal bands. The great lesson that Cretan discoveries have taught us is that the art of what we used to call the good or mature Mycenæan type is not on the upward grade, soon to be arrested by a cataclysm, but well on the

¹ See *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, fig. 87a, p. 138, for the only example earlier than Late Minoan III. found at Knossos. It is Late Minoan II. and was found in the Royal Villa. Specimens from earlier periods were found at Gournia and Hagia Triada. The type may have developed from a vase with two handles on each side of an open mouth. The change to the closed mouth and the hole in the body of the vase below it would in this case presumably have been made for convenience in pouring.

² See *J. H. S.*, xxiii. figs. 13 and 14, pp. 197-8.

downward grade, with its cataclysm behind it. Yet it is still the culture of the Bronze age; there is no trace in the Zafer Papoura cemetery of the use of the brooch or the fibula, and iron is unknown.

At the end of this ninth period the Palace was partly re-inhabited, for what length of time we do not know. In the Geometric age which followed it, however, the site was left absolutely deserted. The tombs which represent it near Knossos still shew a trace of the old tradition in their shape, which is that of a small *tholos* or beehive; the false-necked vase still survives, though in a debased form. But the Iron age has now replaced the Bronze; the use of the fibula is general; the dead are no longer buried but cremated.

In regard to the main lines of this classification we imagine that most scholars will be found in agreement, though further knowledge will probably modify some of its details. In the beginning, however, of the year 1905 there were put forward some revolutionary views which their author's high position prevents us from passing over.¹ Dr. Waldstein lends the authority of a Readership in Archæology at Cambridge to the suggestion that some of Mr. Evans' discoveries are not Minoan at all. He notices that there is much at Knossos that we should not naturally associate with a primitive age, and contrasts with paternal pride the decorously uninteresting character of his own discoveries in the earlier strata of the Heraeum at Argos. He argues further that literary tradition assigns to Crete in pre-historic times a place quite secondary to that occupied by the Argive mainland; that, indeed, it is not till early classical times, the seventh or sixth centuries B.C., that the art of Crete, associated with the names of the early sculptors Dipoinos and Skyllis, has much mention made of it. He concludes that it is 'startling to find that of this period—concerning which we have undoubted evidence as to the predominant position of Crete, not a single trace should have been found, especially in such centres as Knossos';

¹ *Excavations at the Argive Heraeum by Members of the American School at Athens*, edited by Charles Waldstein, vol. ii. 1905. Prefatory note pp. x to xv (The Riverside Press, Cambridge).

and suggests that 'however early some of the Knossian remains and the earliest building may be, some parts of the Palace, especially its plastic decoration in stucco, as well as some of the wall-painting, belong to this later historical period.'

It may at once be admitted that the ordinary educated man, if he approaches Knossos from the standpoint of a general knowledge of classical Greek art, and has never studied the evidence, will be tempted to feel much in sympathy with these views. Minoan art is startlingly modern, and there are few scholars philosophic enough not to receive a series of shocks when they see a scientific drainage and lavatory system and magnificent three-storied staircases assigned to a date which is nearer the Third than the First Millennium before our era. The regularity and perfection of the wall-building is of itself staggering to those whose differentiation of the various styles of cyclopean, polygonal, fifth century, fourth century, and Roman construction is based on the comparisons they have made at Tiryns or Athens or Eleusis. This tendency, however, to doubt the early character of the Palace remains, natural enough as a first impression, does not generally outlast a day's thinking; it has been left for Dr. Waldstein to publish it as a serious and deliberate opinion.¹ In the first place the similarities with later art are often more apparent than real; some of the finest ashlar masonry, that of the northern bath, for instance, or the Royal Villa, is set in limeless mortar or clay bonding which definitely distinguishes it from the mortarless fifth or fourth century walls with which its beautiful jointing and surface would superficially associate it.² Secondly, the mere criterion

¹ It is a pity that Dr. Waldstein did not direct his scepticism to the wild article in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (viii., 1904) in which Mr. C. L. Fisher claims to have discovered a 'Mycenæan Palace' at Nippur in Mesopotamia! Mr. A. Marquand's criticism (*ibid.*, ix. 1905), though correct in its main contention that it is not Mycenæan, nor anything like it, itself contains inaccurate statements.

² We hope that Mr. H. R. Hall will give us information as to points of detail like this in regard to the important comparison he has

of modernity proves too much; if we are surprised at the anticipation of the Roman basilica in the hall of the Royal Villa,¹ and can find no word but Gothic for the arcading of the Throne or the cinquefoil four-cusped arch on a porcelain figurine,² and have never seen the lily design of the frescoes in the south-east house apart from William Morris' wall-papers,³ it does not help us much to transfer the scene of operations to the seventh century B.C. Thirdly, the standard of excellence reached by the art of Dipoinos and Skyllis, as we hear of it in later literature, was most certainly that of their own period, and we can appraise it from contemporary work from other parts of Greece; the tradition which handed down to the Homeric bards 'the dancing-ground that Dædalus wrought at Knossos for fair-haired Ariadne' is a far surer literary evidence for the glory of Minoan art than any that can be claimed for the seventh or sixth centuries. Mr. E. S. Foster's interesting study of the large terra-cottas from the Altar Hill of Præsos⁴ shews us, indeed, the early classical art of Crete *in situ*, and that reaching the standard which we should expect of it. The statement that 'no single trace' of early classical art has been found in Crete is shewn by this single instance to be an exaggeration; the true way of putting it, that on the whole Minoan remains greatly predominate over Hellenic, need not surprise us at all, if we remember the insignificant part played by Crete in the politics of every period of classical Greek history. Even at Knossos—although, as Mr. Evans suggests, the tradition of the ancient sanctuary survived and prevented the actual Palace site being inhabited—there is a zone, including the greater part of the Theatral Area, where Geometrical, classical Greek and Roman remains occur in normal proportions and in natural stratification.⁵

This leads us to our final and conclusive argument. suggested between the wall-building of Knossos and that of Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasty Egypt. *J. H. S.*, xxv. 1905, pp. 331-7.

¹ *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, fig. 89, p. 145.

² *Ibid.* fig. 58, p. 82.

³ *Ibid.* p. 5.

⁴ *Ibid.* viii. 1901-2, pp. 271-281. See especially plate XIII., fig. 1.

⁵ *Ibid.* x. 1903-4, p. 51 &c.

Mr. Evans' results are not obtained from mere stylistic comparisons; there is no danger that he has confused the renascent or derived with the original, the archaistic with the archaic; and he is free from the not infrequent fallacy of thinking that all equally good art must belong to the same period. His method is rather geological than stylistic. It records the stratification of an extensive and long-inhabited site,¹ and it is confirmed by the independent evidence of Phaestos and Gournia and Palaikastro. What profit is it for instance to shake one's head over the marvellous classical masonry of the Northern Bath, when above it, separated from it by a mètre of deposit, which could itself only have accumulated after the destruction and complete filling up of the Bath, is found the cement pavement of a later chamber, the spiral decoration of whose wall stucco would, if found elsewhere, be unhesitatingly classed as 'good Mycenæan.'²

It has seemed worth while to go into some detail in regard to this particular heresy for the simple reasons that it has been broached in the English tongue and that its impossibility has, so far as we are aware, not yet been pointed out. It is less necessary to argue against the almost equally impossible theories which would assign the early art of the Ægean to the Carians or the Phœnicians. Such views have never found support among even a minority of English scholars,³ and the discoveries in Crete have made it still less likely that they will ever do so. When Mycenæan art could be represented as a sudden exotic

¹ An insight can be obtained into Mr. Evans' method by observing some interesting sections he has had drawn, shewing the various strata and floor levels of parts of the Palace. See *B. S. A.*, vii. 1900-1, fig. 20, p. 64, vol. ix. 1902-3, figs. 13 and 14, pp. 26, 27, and x. 1903-4, fig. 7, p. 19, and fig. 17, p. 50.

² *B. S. A.*, vii. 1900-1, pp. 60, 61.

³ For a good criticism of the latest exposition of the Phœnician theory see an article by Dr. Gilbert Murray in the *Quarterly Review* for April 1905 on M. Bérard's *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée*. For the Carians see Dr. Duncan Mackenzie in the lately published volume of the *Excavations of the British School at Phylakopi*, p. 243 &c (Supplementary Paper No. 4 of the Hellenic Society, Macmillan and Co.)

bloom, separated by a gulf from the primitive world which surrounded it, it was tempting to explain it away as an off-shoot of one of the already known Oriental civilizations. The deeper that it is rooted in the Neolithic age, the more clearly that the stages of its growth and decay can be traced, the further back that its days of glory can be pushed, so much the more inconceivable is it that this Ægean culture should be ascribed to a people like the Phœnicians. The influence of Phœnicia in the Ægean was foreign, late, sporadic. It developed in those gradual days of decadence which followed the sack of Knossos. It reached its height only in the dark ages which swept away before the iron swords of the northern invaders all but the memories of art and beauty. It was only then, when the hand of Egypt was weary and relaxed, and the chaos of conquest and migration left the Ægean without a master, that the 'grave Tyrian trader' saw that his day had come to leave the southern coast-land and expand north and west. It was only in virtue of the few centuries which followed the twelfth that he could call 'the Ægean isles' 'his ancient home,' and see the 'merry Grecian coaster' as 'the intruder.'

But Matthew Arnold's well-known stanzas suggest a deeper problem. This

'Merry Grecian coaster'

from Chios or Miletus—these

'Young, light-hearted masters of the waves,'

were they in any real sense entering upon their rightful inheritance? Were they the descendants in race, language, beliefs, of the people who created the early art of the Ægean? Have we any right to call that art Greek?

It may at once be frankly admitted that to these questions no full and adequate answer can yet be given; we can only suggest some of the lines of argument which may some day, with the help of further discoveries, succeed in solving them.

On the important point of physical characteristics we

D D 2

have certainly made some progress. In some early ossuaries at Palaikastro, Dr. W. L. H. Duckworth¹ has been able to measure seventy-eight skulls, fifty-eight of men and twenty of women. The pottery found buried with them was of the good Kamáres period, *i.e.* Middle Minoan II. In the glen of Hagios Nikolaos near Mount Dicte he made similar observations for a still earlier period, which, to judge from his descriptions, should be described as Early Minoan I. or II. His measurements bring out for both periods an overwhelming preponderance of dolichocephalism. At Palaikastro 65·3 of the men, 70·6 of the women were markedly long-headed; only 8·55 of the men, and 5·87 of the women were markedly short- or broad-headed. These figures suggest that the Minoans belonged to the dark-skinned, long-headed, Mediterranean race; and the small average stature of 5 ft. 5 in., which Dr. Duckworth infers from their bones, leads to the same conclusion. The cranial measurements which have been taken of Greeks of classical times have given practically the same results.² On the other hand, these do not yet seem to include any specimens from the classical age in Crete, and Dr. Duckworth's investigation among the modern inhabitants of the same part of the island shew that, so far from agreeing with their Minoan predecessors, they are brachycephalic and have an average height of 5 ft. 7 in. The type which they thus suggest is one that is familiar in the Balkans and the Anatolian plateau. This race may have reached Crete since classical times, but we cannot exclude the possibility of a mixture of races there even in Minoan times when we find Mr. Evans reminded of this same dark-skinned but broad-headed Balkan race by the portrait of the Cupbearer. The fact, indeed, that Dr. Duckworth's investigations only cover a period³ much earlier than this fresco suggests that we must open up some Middle Minoan III. and Late Minoan ossuaries before

¹ *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, pp. 349, 353.

² See authorities quoted by Ridgeway, p. 282, 283. The author, it may be remarked in passing, seems to have quite forgotten what he had previously written on p. 79.

³ See *Monthly Review*, March 1901, p. 124, 125.

we can settle when this second element intruded itself into the population.¹

The whole problem, indeed, that we have to face is one of intrusive elements—when and whence they came, and what particular contribution they made to the general stock. Grant, with most ethnologists, that practically the whole basin of the Mediterranean was inhabited in Neolithic times by a dark-skinned long-headed race; that this race possesses extraordinary persistence, and, in spite of constant invasions and conquests, remains the basis of the present population in Spain, Italy, Greece, and Egypt; that it is the most gifted race in the world, and that the artistic impulse, wherever we find it in the area which it inhabits, has always been due to it. Grant all this, and we are little nearer solving what is the really interesting part of the question, at what times and under what influences² its various branches developed their special characteristics and their widely different languages.

It is at this point that we naturally ask how far light has been thrown on the question of language by recent discoveries. The pictographic and linear scripts of Knossos offer us material in abundance, but we have no bi-lingual records such as gave us the secret of Egyptian and Assyrian, and it is almost too much to hope that we can, without such help, find the data which led Grotefend along his sure chain of inference and enabled him to read Old Persian. Mr. Evans has, indeed, established certain preliminary points; the signs, for instance, for man and woman, some numerals, and objects such as arrows and spears. He has satisfied himself, too, that whereas the pictographic script was written either right to left, or 'boustrophedon,' or left to right, the first class of linear script runs generally, and the

¹ Some results may be obtained from an examination of the skulls contained in the cemetery of Zafer Papoura, but unfortunately only in a few cases were the bones in a condition to admit of it. The measurements taken by Mr. C. H. Hawes during this last year may prove important, but they have not yet been published.

² Mr. H. R. Hall (*J. H. S.*, xxv. 1905, p. 337) has some good remarks as to the extent to which climate and environment may have differentiated the art of the Ægean from that of the Nile.

second class always, in the last direction. Between these two linear scripts, again, he has discovered so many points in common, in one case even what appears to be a personal name,¹ that it appears probable that they represent the same language. His comparisons of all three scripts with other early alphabets suggest many interesting points, such as a connexion with the pre-Dynastic population of Egypt,² but they cannot be said to have led yet to any sure results.³ It should be noticed that the discovery of a linear inscription written in ink inside a cup, and probably with a reed pen, points to the possibility of the existence of a literature more extensive than would naturally have found expression in clay tablets.⁴ Last year's excavations of the 'Little Palace' revealed, too, the important fact that the second class of linear script remained at least in partial use in Late Minoan III.⁵

Far less extensive in bulk, but somewhat nearer decipherment, is the material from Præsos. Its three short inscriptions are written in a fully developed Greek alphabet, although not in the Greek language. They have been subjected to an exhaustive examination by Professor R. S. Conway,⁶ who has made it highly probable that their language is an Indo-European one, with a special kinship to Phrygian and Venetic. The actual inscriptions only date

¹ *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, p. 54.

² *J. H. S.*, xvii. 1897, pp. 377-395.

³ For the strange occurrence of later Greek alphabetic forms as marks on porcelain and other ware in early Egypt, see *B. S. A.*, vii. 1900-1, pp. 118-120. Though occurring as countersigns on seals at Phæstos (*Mon. Ant.* xiii. p. 46) and on certain fishlike bone objects at Knossos, they are unlike either its pictographic or linear scripts.

⁴ *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, figs. 66a and 66b, p. 108.

⁵ See Mr. Evans' Preliminary Report in the *Times* newspaper, Oct. 31, 1905.

⁶ *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2 and x. 1903-4. It should be remembered that whether this language is Indo-European is one question, from what date and how widely it was spoken in Crete, quite another. Mr. H. R. Hall, when criticizing Professor Conway in *J. H. S.*, xxv. 1905, p. 324, n. 10, has not perhaps sufficiently distinguished the two.

from the sixth to the fourth centuries B.C. respectively, but the fact that Præsos was the centre of the people whom classical Greek tradition, as early as Homer, calls the 'Eteo'—or True—Cretans, makes it probable that we are here dealing with a language which was spoken in the island at least before the end of the Bronze age.

If we turn, again, to religious beliefs and practices, we find that Mr. Evans has accumulated a mass of interesting and valuable material, but that it gives no decisive answer to the problem immediately before us. A separate paper would be necessary to deal with the many points in which the earliest aniconic tree and pillar worship of Minoan times suggests comparisons with the primitive religion of the Semites.¹ The evidence points rather to some remote common element, the nature of which is at present obscure, than to any definite borrowing by one side or the other. It certainly excludes the possibility that the similarity is due to the influence of some comparatively late form of Semitic civilization, as we find it in Babylonia or Phœnicia. On the other hand, the direct influence of early Egyptian animal worship, and many other elements in Egyptian religion cannot be doubted; such elements, however, are not taken over bodily, but are adapted. The Griffin, the Sphinx, and the Hippopotamus goddess appear on Cretan gems crossed with native beast-headed demons; and a snake goddess and her votaries, dating from Middle Minoan III., and clearly connected with the cult of the Egyptian mother goddess Hathor, are dressed in the latest fashions of the Minoan Court.² In religion, indeed, as in art generally, Crete translated its loans into indigenous terms, and contributed as much as it received. The goddess with the snakes was herself probably not entirely a new foreign cult, but rather the chthonic aspect of the Nature goddess who seems from first to last to have been the main object of worship in the island. As the serpent, coming from the crevices of the earth, shews the possession of the tree or pillar from the underworld, so the dove, with which

¹ *J. H. S.*, xxi. 1901, pp. 99-204.

² *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, pp. 74-93, figs. 54-58.

this goddess is also associated,¹ shews its possession from the world of the sky. The evidence, too, makes it probable that this dove goddess is not only preserved to us in Aphrodite of Paphos, but also influenced the cult of the Syrian Semiramis and the Phœnician Astarte.

In Crete itself and elsewhere later tradition emphasized another aspect, and treated her as a mother goddess. Thus we hear at Knossos of a grove of Rhea, while the god, who in Minoan times is associated with her on an inferior footing, becomes the son of Rhea, Zeus. While remarking the inheritance that was thus left to classical Greek religion, we must not exaggerate the extent to which it points to common elements of belief. Anthropomorphism has begun in Minoan times, but the earlier aniconic element is still dominant. The snake goddess is not the central object of worship in the Middle Minoan III. shrine, but a marble cross of the orthodox Greek shape²; and in a similar shrine, used, if not constructed, in Later Minoan III., the central place was occupied, not by the terra cotta dove goddess, but by double axes rising out of 'horns of consecration.'³ In the Late Minoan II. Royal Villa there was even built a pillar room, similar to that which marked the earliest stages of the Palace.⁴ This apparent continuity in religious belief is indeed the most significant conclusion for our present purposes that we can draw from the evidence. In religion, as in art, there is no definite break till the end of Late Minoan III. The chief new fact to be noticed, during the course of this period itself, is the apparent recrudescence of a more primitive form of the same cult—grotesque fetish figures, which are merely natural concretions of stalagmite, replacing the beautiful porcelains of earlier times.⁵ The dead are still buried, and the marked

¹ *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, figs. 14, p. 29, 56, p. 99.

² *Ibid.*, ix. 1902-3, figs. 62 and 63, pp. 91, 92.

³ *Ibid.*, viii. 1901-2, fig. 55, p. 97. The double axe, that plays so prominent a part in the Palace cult, was in all probability primarily associated with the goddess and not the god. See *ibid.*, fig. 59, p. 102. For the significance of the double axe, see Mr. H. R. Hall's criticism of Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, *J. H. S.*, xxv. 1905, p. 325.

⁴ *B. S. A.*, ix. 1902-3, fig. 90, p. 150. ⁵ *The Times*, Oct. 31, 1905.

difference of belief which finds expression in cremation does not appear until Late Minoan III. is over and the Geometric age has brought its iron and its fibulæ.

That the most violent break in the civilization of Crete occurs at this point is clear indeed from several converging lines of evidence. We need not imagine that the end came suddenly, or that it came upon all parts of the Ægean at the same moment. The vague echoes which reach us from the Twentieth Dynasty Egypt of Rameses III. shew us that at about the year 1200 B.C. 'the isles were restless,' and that the shock of migration was felt in every quarter of the Ægean. For a long time past we may be sure that the northerners had been coming, here in smaller bodies, there in larger, here peacefully assimilating the culture of the older people, there sacking and destroying; in some places driving those among whom they came to win new homes in their turn by conquest of their kinsmen over seas. The end of Late Minoan III. only marks the time when the old civilization had been dinted with so many repeated blows that it had at last lost its shape and cohesion; when the traditions of the great art of the royal houses, long growing fainter and fainter, had finally died away; when the Egyptian records no longer hint to us of trouble in the Ægean, but, from at least the tenth century Twenty-second Dynasty to the seventh century Twenty-sixth, totally ignore both its commerce and its peoples.¹ That Crete was markedly affected by the movement of peoples which issued in this result is clear from the witness of the Homeric poems. We find in them a suggestion of mixture of races in other parts of the Ægean area, but nowhere is it

¹ As already stated, we cannot yet determine exactly how far down into the Twenty-first Dynasty (1100-960) Late Minoan III. stretched. The end may have come sooner in some places than in others. We have as yet found only one mention of any tribe which can be Ægean so late as the Twenty-first Dynasty, and that in its earliest years. See H. R. Hall in *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, Petrie, *Hist.*, iii., Budge, *Hist.*, vi. And the identification of this particular tribe, the Tchakaray (Hall and Budge), or Zakkaru (Petrie), is doubtful.

so explicit as in the case of Crète.¹ In particular it is the only place in which they recognize the existence of Dorians.

It is probable, then, that, just as the tradition which places Minos before Agamemnon is a vague memory of the fact that the great days of Knossos were prior to those of Mycenæ, so there, too, we have a tradition that Crete was one of the first goals for the northern plunderer. It is possible that in the sack of Knossos at the end of Late Minoan II., we should see some such raid, and that even the earlier and slighter breaks at the end of Middle Minoan II. and Middle Minoan III. mean the intrusion of foreign elements. Mr. Evans, who was at the first inclined rather to over-estimate the significance of the sack of Knossos, and ascribe to it the total overthrow of the old civilization in Crete, is now so impressed with the remains of that civilization which he finds existing in the next period that he goes equally far in the other direction and sees nothing here but 'an internal revolution.'² The fact that the old art, writing, and religion still survive may prove that no considerable body of foreigners settled at Knossos itself after the sack. But the sudden lowering of the standard in art and in wealth, and the recrudescence of more primitive and popular religious beliefs, are much more naturally accounted for by a sudden and fatal blow from the outside to the sea power of the ruling race than by any democratic movement such as Mr. Evans now suggests. Indeed, for such a movement bringing national decadence it would be hard to find a parallel in the whole of ancient history, and its existence at this period is from every point of view improbable. There are indications, too, apart from Knossos, that there were changes in the Ægean world at about this epoch. In the later third city of Phylakopi in Melos, the older type of palace, which resembles that of Knossos, is replaced by another mainland type, resembling that of Tiryns, with a central hearth in its Megaron, and no light-

¹ *Od.*, xix. 170.

² Contrast *Monthly Review*, March 1901, pp. 121, 131, with the *Times* newspaper of Oct. 31, 1905.

well at the back of it.¹ It is also at least a curious coincidence that the word Keftian, which is used in the early Eighteenth Dynasty for the narrow-waisted Cretans who carry vases of the Palace style, falls after this period completely out of use, and is superseded by various other tribal names belonging to 'the peoples of the sea.' We have here, perhaps, if we may use the names symbolically, the sea power of Minos succeeded by the sea power of Agamemnon; and in the latter we may see a mainland form of the old civilization, either forced to expand overseas by pressure from the north, or itself already hardened and transformed by contact with its invaders, and holding a transitional position between the old culture and the new.

Whether the Greek language came into the Ægean at this epoch, or later with the Geometric age,² or earlier at one of the two slighter breaks already noticed, we have no data as yet for determining. Nor can we deny with certainty that it came in much earlier, in the long dim centuries which mark the close of the Neolithic age. That in that period also there was a wandering of peoples is proved by the latest discoveries of pre-dynastic Egypt; while even those who do not hold it proven that in Mesopotamia at about the same period a Semitic language was imposed upon an original and independent Sumerian civilization, yet acknowledge that the apparently uniform and continuous culture of Babylonia must have been the product of a mixed race.³ It would be rash to assert that we know enough of the continuity between Neolithic and Early Minoan art to preclude the possibility of the intrusion of a new language into the Ægean.

¹ *Excavations at Phylakopi*, pp. 269-271; *B. S. A.*, viii. 1901-2, figs. 29, 30, pp. 56, 57.

² As is vigorously argued by Mr. H. R. Hall, *J. H. S.*, xxv. 1905, p. 324.

³ For Egypt see Budge, *Hist.*, i. 1902 and Petrie, *Hist.*, i. 1903. For Babylonia compare M. Jastrow, *Die Religion Babylonien und Assyrien*, 1905 (English translation of earlier edition 1898) with H. V. Hilprecht, *Exploration in Bible Lands*, 1903. Mr. H. R. Hall (*J. H. S.*, xxv. 1905, p. 323) states the case with less reserve than Professor Jastrow.

One hypothesis only can we reject with confidence, that part, namely, of Professor Ridgeway's theory which combines the two propositions that the creators of the Ægean civilization were indigenous and unmixed from the earliest times to the end of the Bronze age, and that they spoke, or rather, we should say, evolved, the Greek language. It could only be justified by the assumption that the original centre of diffusion of the Indo-European group of languages was the shores of the Mediterranean, and that the dialect which was afterwards to grow into Greek was left stranded there at a remote period. The linguistic and historical improbabilities of such a theory would on general grounds put it out of court, even if we do not, with some scholars, see in isolated languages such as Basque and Finnish, and certain place-names and other primitive features in the Greek language itself, traces of a pre-Aryan element in Europe.¹

Another question which is discussed at length in Professor Ridgeway's book, the equation of tribal names mentioned in classical Greek tradition with particular stages of early history, has received more attention than it deserves. Professor Ridgeway has done a service in emphasizing the fact that the Greeks, as we know them, came of a mixed race, and that the word Pelasgian, which they themselves used of one of the early elements in its composition, must be connected with at least some phase of 'Mycenæan' civilization. Much further than this we cannot go. There is doubtless a kernel of historical truth in most of the old Greek legends, but their very complexity prevents us from resting content with any such simple theory as that which gives us Pelasgian *plus* Achæan *plus* Dorian as an adequate account of the race history of the Ægean. In the genealogies themselves Minos is, after all, as much Dorian as he is Phœnician, and as much Phœnician as he is Pelasgian; Danaus and the Perseids are only Pelasgian in the same sense that Ægyptus is; Agamemnon and the Pelopidae are not Achæan at all. We are on surer ground when we turn from

¹ See, e.g., Mr. Cowley's Ugro-Finnic theory noticed in the *Classical Review*, xix. 1905, p. 71.

genealogies and the attempts of the later classical world to synchronize and harmonize, to the general impression left on us when we compare the culture described in the Homeric poems and that which we have here been discussing.

That there are memories in them of the full glory of Knossos and Mycenæ all scholars are agreed. The Palace of Alkinoos, the Shield of Achilles, take us back behind the transitional period to Late Minoan I. and II. Whether or no such traditions were, at the time or near it, put into any sort of verse, in Greek or any other language, we have no data for determining. The story of the poems, however, and the main texture of the civilization which they presuppose cannot refer to a period earlier than Late Minoan III. The singers of the first Greek ballads upon which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are based imagined the sea power of Agamemnon as existing in this transitional period at the close of the Bronze age, and described its culture so far as they knew it. Whether or no they were themselves of the same race or language as the men whose deeds they were singing, we cannot tell. In course of time the development of the story passed into the hands of singers whose weapons and customs of burial were different from those that we find, at least at Knossos, even in Late Minoan III. Yet we must remember that the shields and cuirasses of the famous Warrior vase of Mycenæ,¹ and the cremation graves

¹ Schuchhardt-Schliemann, fig. 284. In *The Early Age of Greece*, vol. i, pp. 315-317 (cf. pp. 32, 489), Professor Ridgeway accepts this vase and other kindred objects as a 'trace of the Achæan domination, brief though it was.' He is here feeling after a point of view which would place his 'Achæan' age between the full 'Mycenæan' and the full 'Geometric' or 'Dipylon' age. The attention, however, both of his followers and his critics is—not without justification—generally concentrated on other passages, such as pp. 266 and 314, where he talks of the 'Homeric age' as the 'fully developed Iron age,' and argues vehemently against those who try 'to bridge the great gulf' between it and 'the Mycenæan Bronze age.' Yet this is just what in these wiser moments he is himself doing! The fact is that his position is hampered both by his over-insistence on the antithesis between Pelasgian and Achæan and by the particular theory which he has adopted of the composition of the Homeric poems.

at Salamis, suggest that in some parts of Greece at any rate the change occurred early, before the Geometric Iron age can be said to have definitely begun. How far in the poems, as we now have them, there are still later elements, we need not here discuss. This much is clear, that the right method of dealing with the differences of custom which we find existing side by side in them is neither to treat as spurious all that is late, nor to explain away all that is early. Reichel rejected the round shield as 'un-Homeric,' and, by a process which Professor Ridgeway rightly calls Procrustean, created a fallacious unity. Professor Ridgeway himself cries peace where there is no peace, and accepts the figure-of-eight shield for his uniform un-Mycenæan civilization only on the ground that the single bard who once and for all composed the *Iliad* in the Achæan age remembered that Periphetes¹ was 'one of the native Mycenæans and not an Achæan,' and therefore 'still wore the ancient shield of his race'!

Let us avoid both methods as equally unsound. Homeric civilization is like Homeric language. As the one was never spoken, so the other was never lived, by any one society. They have a meaning and a unity of their own only in so far as genius has fused the traditions and the songs of diverse lands and peoples into one perfect work of art.

¹ *Iliad*, xv. 638. *Early Age of Greece*, pp. 321 and 624.

ART. VII.—LIBERAL THEOLOGY, II.

1. *Exploratio Evangelica*. A Brief Examination of the Basis and Origin of Christian Belief. By PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D. (London : A. and C. Black, 1899.)
2. *Contentio Veritatis*. Essays in Constructive Theology. By SIX OXFORD TUTORS. (London : Murray, 1902.)
3. *The Ritschlian Theology, Critical and Constructive*. An Exposition and an Estimate. By A. E. GARVIE, M.A., B.D. Second Edition. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1902.)
4. *The Virgin Birth of Christ*. By P. LOBSTEIN. With an Introduction by W. D. MORRISON, LL.D. (London : Williams and Norgate, 1903.)
5. *Christus in Ecclesia*. By HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1904.)

VII.

IN our former article we concluded 'that Christianity cannot be detached from its foundations in a miraculous history without losing its distinctively religious value—without losing its distinctive character as true religion.'¹ This brings us face to face with the cardinal question—Have miracles ever happened?

The Church propounds for belief a body of doctrine which presupposes and recapitulates a miraculous history, and as Christians we accept that presupposition. Why do we do so? Why do we believe that the Word became flesh? that the Incarnation was mediated by the Virgin-Birth? that our Lord's body did not see corruption, but rose from the grave and ascended into the heavenly places? that during our Lord's life upon earth natural things became wonderfully responsive, in unwonted ways, to the present power of Divine Love?

Professor Huxley—was it not?—once told us that were his dearest friend to report that he had seen a centaur in Pall Mall he would not believe him. Probably none of us would; but why not? Because a centaur in Pall

¹ *C.Q.R.*, October 1905, p. 31.

Mall would be irrational—not connected with anything that we know of Nature or reasonably surmise concerning that ultimate Reality which is the principiant of Nature. Remove this 'unrelatedness'—shew some sufficient reason for the presence of a centaur in Pall Mall—and our incredulity, if not merely stupid, would at least become patient of inquiry, for the report would become probably true.

Now, as we have already seen, the essential Christian miracles have precisely this *a priori* credibility. If Reality be what we reasonably believe it to be, the cardinal Christian miracles, or others equivalent thereto, *ought* to have taken place. Were they absent from History, it would be necessary at least to revise—we do not say abandon—our general view of the world, the very foundation of our Theism.

Independently of the Christian revelation, we have reason for believing Nature to be the creation of God, and the final cause of the world to be an ethical end. And this makes the central Christian *credenda* to be *a priori* credible. If the purpose of God in creation be to fashion for Himself a catholic family informed and knit together by Love—if His end be that which the potency of human nature makes naturally sovereign for each one of us, it is reasonable to look for marks of that purpose in History. We have, it is true, our ideals, which persuasively invite us to become the best that we can be; but these ideals are psychological constructs, and illustrate primarily only the potency which makes us what we are. We do not *know* that the goal to which they point is attainable. History has often written comments upon them which seem bitterly adverse, and some thinkers of reputation have told us that they are only by-products of a purposeless order which is indifferent to our aspirations and alien from our hope. Had the heavens remained silent, had no declaration come to us that the ends which seem sovereign are really sovereign—that they interpret truly the creative principle which sustains the world, and are therefore ontological, and not merely psychological—our very Theism would be but a shadowy postulate, the faint breath of a piety that was only not quite hopeless. But—'thanks be to God for His unspeak-

able gift!—the heavens have not been silent. They have echoed to the tidings of great joy, and under the darkened skies the Cross is even to-day eloquent of a sovereign Love from which nothing can separate us.

But why do we believe that History has been thus evangelical? We believe this, it will be said, because of the evidence. Yes; but what is the evidence? It is frequently said that we cannot reasonably believe miracles to have happened without very much stronger evidence than would suffice to establish the historical reality of an ordinary event. But this preliminary canon we can confidently set aside. It is true only if a given report have no *a priori* credibility, and expresses at the most only a conviction that Nature *is* Nature, and not Chaos—a realm of orderly becoming, and not of arbitrary or chance happening. But, *a priori*, the Christian miracles are credible, not incredible, and they are so far from destroying our thought of the world's reasonable order that they compel us to interpret that order in higher terms—those of ethical purpose—than would ever be suggested by unbroken uniformity of sequence. They reveal the true character of the world's order, and, by linking the uniformities of natural becoming with a sovereign and unifying purpose they make them what in themselves they certainly are not—a true, although imperfect, expression of the world's organic unity.¹ Therefore, we may rightly be content if the Christian evidences be ordinarily clear and pertinent. For instance, if we have the report of an eye-witness whom we have reason to believe to have been an honest man and no fool, what more do we want?

It must be remembered that miraculous character is always inferred and never patent. St. Peter's confession, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' was an inference, not the declaration of an obvious fact. Similarly, we believe the feeding of the five thousand to have been miraculous, but our belief is the result of inference. Even

¹ Uniformity, in and by itself, is not a principle of unification. It becomes an expression of unity only if and when it is derived from some 'Law of Substance' or creative purpose.

had we been there, we had heard only the words of blessing and seen only the multiplying bread. The Divine side of the event—the Divine operation which made it miraculous—was hidden, not manifest, and we reach it only by an inference which is essentially an act of faith. For this inference we may reasonably require generous warrant, but the facts themselves—the miracle on its phenomenal side—can be established, surely, by ordinary evidence. It is said that on a certain day our Lord blessed five barley loaves and two small fishes, and therewith fed five thousand men, besides women and children. It is very wonderful, no doubt, but the facts, when taken one by one, seem very simple, and it is not easy to discover any reason for thinking that their historical reality can be reasonably established only by evidence stronger than would suffice were the facts as reported only commonplace.

This at once suggests the thought, and we deem it an important one, that our acceptance of the Christian miracles—our belief, for instance, that Christ was and is God Incarnate, that He raised the dead and Himself rose from the dead on the third day—cannot be adequately represented as the result of any one chain of inference, but should be set forth as the conclusion of a complex argument in which there are many strands.¹

Our belief that certain things, which we interpret as miracles, were actual events rests proximately upon the evangelical narratives. It is sometimes claimed that the canons of reasonable criticism apply to the Holy Scriptures no less than to other books, and the claim is undoubtedly valid. But what are 'the canons of reasonable criticism'? The primary canon is a very well-known one: 'The irrational cannot be true.' And the test and note of rationality is—what? Orderliness or harmony. A thing is rational if it form part of a systematic whole which can be construed by thought. Now, the primary Christian miracles are in this sense rational. They are not crude facts, but they are

¹ The accepting act of faith may not unreasonably be called simple, but here we are speaking of its determining antecedents, or, more accurately, of its rational presuppositions.

intelligible facts—parts of a reasonable order, reasonably expected witnesses to the ultimate nature of that order. They are, as we have seen, antecedently credible; when we think of them not as events but as reported events, we see that, if actual, they are rational.

(a) 'The irrational cannot be true.' This is our warrant for rejecting many a report of the miraculous. We do not say, *a priori*, This narrative is false because it reports a miracle. We reject it—if we do, in fact, reject it—because it reports something irrational. Because that 'something' is irrational we are quite certain that the report of it is untrustworthy—that, whatever actual events and psychological processes be behind the narrative, the reported miracle did not occur. And we are certain of this, not because miracles are incredible—they are not incredible—but because the irrational is incredible.

The primary note of the irrational is 'unrelatedness.' If we have before us the report of something which we cannot harmonize with what we know of the world—of something which we cannot construe as part of a rational order—we reject that report, and we rightly reject it, because we cannot reasonably believe that the irrational is or ever has been constituent in History.

By this principle, then, we purge the records of secular history, but we leave the cardinal Christian miracles untouched. They are untouched, however, not because they belong to a different order or are exempt from the ordinary canons of criticism. The order of Reality is a monistic order. Our adjectives 'secular' and 'sacred' do not denote separate orders of becoming, but different aspects of one order. Our primary canon of criticism is universal, and if, when we use it, we reject certain secular narratives and accept certain evangelical narratives, it is simply because the two sets of narratives are seen, when tested by that primary canon, to be essentially different. The former report things that are irrational, and therefore incredible. The latter report things that are rational, and therefore credible.

We are sometimes told that the scientific method of

historical inquiry presupposes that if a document report the miraculous, it is thereby known to be not completely trustworthy. It is said that this presupposition rests upon a wide historical induction, and we are asked to shew cause why it should not be normal in the interpretation of Holy Scripture. Our reply is that the presupposition is *not* a general canon of criticism, but only a somewhat clumsy empirical rule, which some historians have found useful. It is either a deduction from a false philosophy, or a generalization from a limited diplomatic field—from the field covered by the documents of secular history. It may usefully purge certain records, but we have no warrant for making it general. Even within its original field it has undoubtedly caused more than one report of the miraculous to be improperly rejected. We now see more clearly than our fathers did that the world is not commonplace throughout. We are less stubbornly incredulous of the wonderful, although we do not always find it necessary to regard the wonderful as miraculous. The maxim 'Miracles are incredible' is not a scientific maxim; it does not form part of the critical apparatus of historical science. At the very best it is a rule-of-thumb criterion, which the prudent will often abstain from using, or a crude presentation of that very different maxim, 'The irrational is incredible,' which is truly normal for *all* historical inquiry. But this maxim, as we have seen, leaves the cardinal Christian miracles untouched.

(β) 'The irrational is incredible.' Because *this* is the true canon of criticism we do not reject a narrative as untrustworthy only and simply because it reports a miracle. If we reject such a narrative—as we very often do—we reject it, not because it reports the miraculous, but because it reports the irrational.

A further important consequence also follows: Because the primary canon of criticism is what it is we cannot say that a 'non-miraculous' version of given events, *because* 'non-miraculous,' is necessarily more trustworthy than a 'miraculous' version, or that a 'non-miraculous' text, because 'non-miraculous,' is more likely to be authentic

than an alternative text which reports a miracle. Because a text is seemingly simple it is not, therefore, more nearly original. We could so argue only if we believed miracles to be only and always mythical. Zoology abundantly illustrates the derivation of the seemingly simple from the more complex, and, prior to inquiry, it is always possible that a seemingly simple text is not primitive, but depraved, and depraved otherwise than by the errors of a copyist—for instance, by heretical opinions.

(γ) This, then, is the primary canon of historical criticism: 'The irrational is incredible.' Obviously, however, it is what we have called it—a principle of *criticism*; it does not permit us to infer that the credible is actual. Even religious knowledge comes to us only in and through experience. We systematize our knowledge in various ways and for various purposes, and if we be philosophers we endeavour to systematize the whole of it and to form a general theory which, with more or less of vigilant modesty, we accept as normal for thought and practice. But these adventures of thought, even those which are religious, are hypothetical, and do not bring us knowledge. Their results are probable, not certain, and, however complete our constructions seem, we cannot deduce from them the particulars of History.¹ We assume, for instance, that Reality is rational, and we interpret it pragmatically, according to the promptings of our spiritual life. But the rationality of the world is an assumption, and pragmatism a venture of faith, which can never become anything else. We do not *know*, and not even the Beatific Vision could make us know, that the purposes of human life are normal for the interpretation of the world—that the moral ideal is the final cause of Nature or constituent therein. We do not even *know* that Nature has a final cause.² Our thought is never certainly

¹ We cannot prove the Virgin Birth actual by any demonstration of theological necessity, nor determine with certainty the nature of our Lord's human knowledge by any inference from His substantial Godhead.

² This does not mean that doubt is eternally inevitable. 'Perfect love casteth out fear,' and even here and now the life of faith lifts us above our doubts. It does not and cannot give us knowledge,

predictive. *A priori*, its constructions are only probable, and the degree of probability is, in each individual case, indemonstrable. Therefore, a sound judgement is always watchfully attendant upon experience, which it can helpfully construe, but cannot certainly anticipate. Our constructive thought does not make us independent of the world's actuality, but makes our primacy therein credible.

Therefore, however great the value of the Christian *Welt-Anschauung*, our belief in the evangelical miracles must rest, if not ultimately, at least inseparably, upon grounds which are historical.

Our primary canon, then, does not enable us to establish deductively the actual particulars of History. Neither does it disclose any warrant for accepting every report of the miraculous which comes to us with an evangelical context. It is always and everywhere a canon of criticism, and, if it confirm our faith in this or that evangelical narrative, it does so by revealing in the narrative an essential rationality, and, therefore, an antecedent credibility.

VIII.

We have said that a miracle always has a reality, which its phenomenal character as an event apparent upon the theatre of History does not exhaust. Besides its manifest character as an event, it has another character which it derives from its relation to the ultimate ground of things. Herein it is like every other event; for every event has a twofold character, in part patent to observation, and in part occult—accessible, if at all, only by an act of inference which is essentially a venture of faith. Moreover, the true principiant of all events is to be found in the purpose of God. A miracle is a miracle because it discloses an aspect of that purpose not disclosed or not so clearly disclosed by other events. We have said that miracles are caused by special determinations of the Divine Will. But that

but it gives assurance—what Cardinal Newman called 'certitude.' Doubt still remains an intellectual possibility, but the grace of God prevents it, and, although potential, it does not become actual.

Will is equally operative, with an equally precise determination, in ordinary events, and is operative therein to the same general end that determines its action in miracle. All events have the same final cause. A miracle is a miracle not because uniquely determined, but because uniquely declaratory—because it is an operation of the Divine Will which discloses some aspect of the Divine purpose not disclosed or not so clearly disclosed by other operations of that Will.

But our attribution of such a character to a particular event is an act of faith—or, more accurately, of inference that presupposes faith. Of the complex reality which constitutes a miraculous event, only the phenomenal part is perceptible. But that part *is* perceptible, and the observation of it is no more difficult than the observation of anything else phenomenal. Therefore, the historical reality of it may be sufficiently attested by ordinary evidence. The first and nearest ground of our belief in the evangelical miracles is to be found in the evangelical narratives, which report the occurrence of certain unusual events.

It is sometimes said

(1) That a miracle, were one to occur, would be an isolated event—something unconnected with the ordinary processes of Nature, and inexplicable by the observed uniformities of Nature ;

(2) That our belief in the uniformity of Nature would make the report of such an event incredible.

This conclusion is substantially sound. As we have already seen, an isolated event would be an irrational event, and the irrational is essentially incredible. But the cardinal Christian wonders are not isolated events. As phenomena they disclose an historical character and illustrate an historical vocation—the character and vocation of our Lord—and their relation to this character and vocation is not something inferred, but something given, something which forms part of their historical reality. Because of this relation we call these wonders miracles. It follows, therefore, that our answer to the question, 'What think ye of these things ?' is determined by our answer to another

question—'What think ye of Christ?' and if our answer to *this* question be the Catholic answer, everything which makes us Christians is principiant thereto.

We have said that the cardinal evangelical marvels disclose the character and illustrate the vocation of our Lord. The narratives which report the wonders are also biographical, and set forth the Person. They set forth the Person, but their words alone cannot make us know Him. No merely literary exercise can disclose the spiritual secrets of any life record. He who would truly know another must have not only the observant mind, but a receptive and interpreting heart. And to know Christ—even to know Him 'after the flesh,' in the reality of His human life—is not easy. To know the content of the Gospel records is not a hard thing: it is quite another matter to know the Person whom those records disclose. He is so different from us. His charity ignores our worldly wisdom; His faith outsoars our prudence; His sincerity shames our contrivings. We belong to the world that now is, busy with its policies, laborious for its tangible rewards. He speaks only of another Kingdom which none but the child-like in heart can enter. And few of us are by nature child-like. Rather are we self-confident, eager for dominion and possession, proud in masterful use of life's visible certainties. Not easily do most of us become child-like. Not until we are bankrupt, not until the instruments fashioned by the world's wisdom for the world's strength are all broken, and disappointment has made trust the only alternative to despair, do some of us make discovery of our better selves within the ruins of our self-will. And until we make this discovery we cannot begin to know the Son of Man.

We cannot begin to know Him, for He can be known only by the like-minded. To those who are of another mind He can, at the most, be only an uncomprehended marvel, the shadowy centre of an unpractical romance—unattractive in proportion to their 'otherness.' Even if by some original grace of character or wholesome severity of discipline we be brought to the beginnings of knowledge, it is no easy thing to make our knowledge complete. We can ente

into the secret of another's life only if our own has, in essential particulars, been similar—kindred in purpose, in experience, in endeavour. And it is not easy to become like unto the Son of Man, and faithfully to 'follow the blessed steps of His most holy life.' It is no easy thing to share His sorrow for the sins of men, His perfect trust in a Wisdom which the prudence of this world thinks foolish, His magnanimous patience and selfless charity. To spend our lives for others, regardless of worldly gain, to renounce ambition that we may the more effectually serve, to know His constant communion with God and the spirit of His martyrdom, to be baptized with His baptism and to drink of His cup—to achieve this is far from easy; but unless we achieve this we cannot fully know the Son of Man. The thought of Him must become a perpetual peace and an informing light, His words our better conscience, His example a besetting invitation and a transforming strength; we must be built up into His likeness—then, and not until then, shall we truly know Him.

And, when we thus know the Son of Man, the question comes to us: 'What think ye of Him?' 'Whom say ye that I am?' When this question was first put, St. Peter gave the answer which immediately became normal, and for nineteen centuries the Catholic Church has repeated that first confession. But the repetition has been more than a repetition, for in it a constantly renewed experience has become articulate.

'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.' We cannot make these words our own by any processes which are merely intellectual. Only if we have known Christ as the Life-giver can we, with practically effective conviction, affirm His Godhead. Christian belief rests upon Christian experience; in it that experience becomes articulate. It was so in the case of the first disciples; it has ever been so throughout the age-long history of the Church; it is so to-day with all those whose Christianity is more than nominal. It would be misleading to say that Christianity¹ is a life, not

¹ In this connexion 'Christianity' denotes 'that which makes a man a Christian.'

a creed, but, undoubtedly, Christianity has its foundations in life—in the personal life of each individual believer. We confess that the Word became flesh, because we have seen the glory of the Lord and felt His power. We have discovered within ourselves not only shortcoming and defect, but also sin. We have discovered, also, a Power which can lift us above our sins into a life perennially made new. And that new life is unmistakably and characteristically a dependent life—dependent upon the Power which first makes it our own. We do not save ourselves. 'By grace are ye saved, through faith.' Even when we first awaken to our sinfulness, it is some quickening touch from without that enables us to see, and the new energy which first lifts us above our sins is an energy which we receive, but do not create. The new birth is not a change which we achieve unto, but a change that we experience—wrought in us by a Power that we know to be not our own; and the consequent new life is not sustained by the native resources of our own hearts, nor by the outward exercises of charity—these might strengthen a power merely psychological—but by faith, wherein we become communicant.

The attempt to separate the moment of conversion or repentance from the rest of the Christian life is entirely mistaken. The change of heart and purpose which we call the new birth is not a miracle wrought once for all. It is only a commencement. We then begin to use the Divine provision for our souls, but every later moment in the new life is in this essential particular like unto the first, for it is a moment wherein we lay hold of the grace of God. The new life is a creation eternally renewed. It commences in the discovery of a saving Power; it is sustained only by constant communion with that Power. And that communion takes place—how? Through prayer and meditation, through the self-discipline connoted by fasting, through repentance constantly renewed, through the reverent submission of our hearts to a rule of holiness and our lives to a rule of charity, through open-hearted trust. The grace of God is not a mechanical influx, but a living food—

provided, indeed, for all, but received only by hearts that are prepared for it.

And this food comes to us in the fellowship of the Christian Church, wherein we are prepared to receive it. The grace of God is a universal grace, provided for every lawful state of life, ministered through every institution not wholly bad; and, as every institution has its distinctive function, so through every institution comes some distinctive form of grace. Now, the characteristic function of the Christian Church is to make and keep men Christian. The Christian Church is the home of the Christian life, because it nourishes that life, and thereby forms the Christian character. And the more real our fellowship in the Christian society, the more complete our Christian experience, the more largely we become communicant of the grace which is the strength of that life. And out of this experience of a life perennially made new arise the affirmations of Christian faith. Our best life is always a dependent life: we are not self-sufficient. Even after we have intended to make life's better possibilities determinant of life's purpose, those possibilities can become effectually determinant only by a strength not our own—only by grace received through faith. That grace comes to us in many ways, for the invitation to faith is manifold; but it comes to us most effectually and in largest measure within the fellowship of the Christian society, which exists primarily to prepare us for it. And this experience of ours is not exceptional. It does but repeat the experience of 'a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation and of all tribes and peoples and tongues.' The first disciples found life in the Christ; in every succeeding generation 'holy and humble men of heart' have found life in His Church, and when we also find it there we do but repeat a well-attested discovery. In every Christian century the Christian Church has been the home of the Christian life, opening the blind eyes, healing the broken in heart, confirming the feeble knees, controlling history to ends higher than any disclosed by man's secular purpose, and thereby 'making straight in the desert a highway for our God.' It is man's age-

long and world-wide experience of this—an experience daily repeated and renewed in individual hearts—which is the true ground of the Christian affirmations.

It is as participant in this experience that we most truly know the Son of Man, and, knowing Him therein, we discover that which nothing short of the Catholic affirmations can adequately set forth or explain. We affirm the miracle of His Nature not merely as an inference from the text of Holy Scripture, but as an inference from nineteen centuries of History, from an experience which goes back to Galilee and is daily renewed within ourselves.

Some willingness to believe what the Church has always believed we must, indeed, bring with us when we enter the Christian fellowship. The initial creed of discipleship has ordinarily but few articles, and those very vaguely defined. The thought that affirms it is not independently speculative, but is strictly controlled and determined by the spiritual needs which prompt to discipleship. Indeed, those first assents of awaking faith—if one views them in the 'high and dry light of the understanding'—seem little more than provisional affirmations, preliminary to a practical experiment in living. But that experiment, if successful, confirms those preliminary assents, and develops them in a reasonable affirmation of the Christian creed. We say 'a reasonable affirmation,' for the Christian assents are not mystical, nor are they the work of some specially aroused or imparted capacity for faith, which operates independently of reason. In their most complete form they are inferences. We believe the Christian *credenda* because, apart from them, our experience would not be intelligible, because a denial of them would impoverish our lives by separating us from spiritual helps for which we have no substitutes.

Ultimately, then, the Christian assents are an affirmation of the moral order of the world—of the rationality of the world as disclosed along a particular line, or throughout a particular range, of experience. And this affirmation, like all our primary speculative affirmations, is pragmatist—made because its content is practically valuable. Theological thought, like every other thought which essays to interpret

the world, is never disinterested. Its final determinations come from interests that are practical, not speculative.

We have said that the Christian assents are ultimately an affirmation of the moral order of the world. But even this affirmation is not quite ultimate. It presupposes the good will—the will which accepts human ideals as normal for human thought and human life. But if this good will be given—if the primary ethical resolve be made—the Christian assents can be exhibited as a reasonable interpretation of Christian experience. Our belief, then, that Christianity has its foundations in a miraculous history is the result not of some narrow line of inference from the Christian texts, but from everything that makes us Christian. It is because of our experience, because of the whole body of Christian experience, that we regard the evangelical marvels as miracles. We cannot certainly deduce the actual particulars of history from any general view of the world—not even from the one which Christian experience makes reasonable—but Christian experience constitutes a reasonable ground for believing that certain recorded particulars were miraculous.

But Christian experience cannot make us independent of historical inquiry. It guides our interpretation of a given *explicandum*—the marvels recorded in the evangelical narratives—but that *explicandum* exists independently of our experience within the Christian fellowship, and its historical value must be ascertained by the ordinary methods of scientific research. But our appeal to science is not a general appeal. We do not ask, 'Did these alleged miracles occur?' but 'Are these documents trustworthy as records of phenomenal History?' We take only the outward and unexplained facts from the science of Diplomatic Criticism; our interpretation of those facts is independent—not derived from that science, and not subject to its censure.

Now, when our speculative thought receives from the hands of criticism the evangelical marvels which are constituent in its *explicandum*, it does not receive them as isolated events. They are inseparably connected with the life of our Lord—with His character and confessed

vocation—and also with the subsequent history of Christian experience. They do not come before the tribunal of interpretative thought as unrelated happenings. If we isolate them we are abstracting from the concrete reality of History. Such abstraction may, for certain purposes, be legitimate, and even necessary, but it always leaves some part of reality behind it. It is not as thus impoverished that the evangelical marvels become *data* for philosophy. Even before we interpret them as miracles—while yet we regard them only as ‘happenings’—we know that they have a context, that they are not isolated. This ‘relatedness’ is part of their historical reality—part of the reality which our speculative thought essays to interpret—and it is thence that we infer to them a miraculous character. And when we make this inference the miracles we then suppose are not isolated. They form part of an order of revelation wherein God, because He is Love, declares Himself to be Love. And this Divine revelation is not an intrusion into the world’s order; rather, it is itself part of that order, and makes known the true nature of that order—a nature only imperfectly apparent in the world’s natural uniformities. This is the Christian philosophy of History:

Human nature is a potency not yet become completely actual. That potency, as it exists in each one of us, is the ground of our ideals, which set forth its completeness. Thus our nature is characteristically ethical and teleological. But if our ethical end be a reasonable end, the order of Reality wherein that end has to be wrought out must itself be ethical and teleological. But if Reality be properly thus described, it is purposeful and benevolent. Purposeful benevolence, however, can belong only to a Person. In this way we reach the central conception of Theism. But we reach it by an inference which has large presuppositions, and history sometimes seems bitterly adverse to our adventurous hope. Yet, unless our inference be valid, the best thing that we know—the good life itself—is but vanity, and our better possibilities, which seem sovereign, have no primacy.

But the Creative Love has become articulate in the

Christian revelation. Our Lord came to 'shew us the Father.' The central thought in His teaching is that of the Fatherhood of God, and what He taught in words He illustrated by His Person. God became man to confirm our trust in Him. He submitted to the conditions of human experience that by love He might win us to love. And the Love which made the Word incarnate moved the Incarnate Word to gracious helpfulness in works 'which none other man' did. Our Lord's miracles are instrumental to His mission; they manifest a Power which was the present Power of the Divine Love. And, that the witness of the Incarnation might be continually renewed, 'for the healing of the nations,' our Lord established His Church, as a society wherein human lives were to be edified in love, in order that human hearts might make discovery of the Divine Fatherhood, and in that discovery find peace—from that discovery draw strength.

Our Lord came to set forth the Fatherhood of God, and the Christian religion exists to make men trust that Fatherhood. It is a spiritual discipline, exercised through a visible society wherein the witness of the Incarnation is made perpetual—a discipline whereby the hearts of men are prepared to receive that witness, and, receiving it, to discover life.

Therefore, when we affirm the Christian miracles we affirm them not as isolated events, but as a particular illustration of the moral order of the world; and, once more, our affirmation is determined not by a small body of documentary evidence, but by everything that makes us Christians.

IX.

Our belief in the evangelical miracles has its ground in experience, in the general Christian consciousness, in the life of the Christian society. But that ground is the ground of our interpretation: that which we interpret—the wonders which constitute our *explicandum*—we receive from the Science of History. The Christian consciousness is explanatory, not constitutive. It does not create or posit the

evangelical facts; it interprets them. And its interpretations are existential—not judgements of value, but attributions of an essential nature. Our Christology is metaphysical—stated in terms of essence, not in terms of value. It is true that 'experienced value' is the ground of our judgements, but those judgements predicate essence, not value. We say 'Christ is God,' not 'Christ has for us the religious value of God.' Theology has its roots in experience—in psychology, as Professor Gardner would say—but constituent in that experience is the Christian re-presentation of evangelical history; and theology does not merely interpret the psychological content of this or that man's experience—it interprets that experience as a *conditioned* experience, and the most important conditions of that experience are the general Christian experience which it reproduces and the evangelical history which is its inseparable foundation.

Because our belief in miracles has this ground in the Christian society, that belief is really an expression of our faith in that society. We affirm the miraculous character of the evangelical marvels because of our trust in the witness and work of the Church—because we believe 'one Catholick and Apostolick Church.' The Christian society grew out of the evangelical history—it is a result of the Incarnate Life, and its distinctive function is to perpetuate the witness of that Life and to make that witness effectual in the lives of men. It discharges this function by edifying its members in love. Its witness is a witness to a history charged with metaphysical meaning; the instruments of its missionary work are ethical. By its characteristic discipline of life and formation of character it prepares us to receive its witness, and, after nineteen centuries, revives in us the faith of those first disciples who veritably looked upon and handled the Word of Life, and to whom the evangelical history was immediately present. For this reason it is rightly called 'the pillar and ground of truth,' and, although men often mistake the nature of its authority, they rightly attribute authority to it. It truly has authority—not authority which comes to us, *ab externo*, with a crude

claim to crude (unmediated) sovereignty, but authority which lives in the heart daily renewed and in the life informed by a new purpose, transformed by a new strength—authority which, because of the work thus accomplished, constrains us, 'with cords of a man, with bands of love,' to make the Church's affirmations our own.¹

And although this authority is primarily an interpretative authority, it becomes us to remember that the society thus authoritative is the keeper of the evangelical records, which, indeed, arose out of its earliest life. The Church is the historical context of Holy Scripture, and our historical inquiries may not ignore that context. If we are constrained to believe that the Church guides us to right interpretation, it will be difficult for us to believe that the *explicandum* which it has preserved for us is, in any important ways, misleading or untrue.²

The Church perpetuates the witness of the Incarnate Life, of an historical revelation made 'once for all,' in a manner 'full, perfect, and sufficient.' Therefore, it rightly propounds the essentials of that witness in permanent creeds, 'which except a man believe faithfully, *salvus esse non poterit*.' 'He cannot be saved' we say in our English speech, and the words ring harshly, but their harshness is accidental and misleading. '*Salvus esse non poterit*,' for Christ gave a unique assurance—one not discoverable elsewhere, and one for which no substitute can be found. Apart from that assurance we are without hope in the world, or, at the most, have only a tenuous hope, which the world's secular history does not confirm. And we can effectually receive that assurance only if we accept its historical mediation through the Incarnate Life. Therefore, outside

¹ This conception of 'authority' is a philosophical conception. There are many who discover in the text of Holy Scripture theological warrant for attributing to the Church an authority somewhat differently defined, but with this theological conception we have not at the present moment any concern.

² This does not imply that criticism should be controlled by authority, but only that the connexion between the Holy Scriptures and the authoritative Christian society is one of the facts with which a complete criticism must deal.

the Christian order, apart from the evangelical history, and in separation from the social ministry of grace which revives in us the witness of that history, man '*salvus esse non poterit.*'

It is sometimes said that the Church has wasted its strength in Christological speculations and neglected 'the weightier matters of the law.' But are not those 'weightier matters of the law,' weightier only because the order of the world is a moral order, only because of their ontological ground in the character of God? Take the weightiest of all—faith, hope, and charity; these are greatest not because conscience declares them primary, but because God is what He is, and what He is we know only in and through the Person of Christ.

Moreover, if it be the mission of the Church to continue the witness of the Incarnate Life, it must surely be its primary duty to safeguard for our thought the full reality of that Life? The primary interest, not only of Christian thought, but also of the Christian life, is a Christological interest. The Person of Christ is our 'Impregnable Rock.' His religious value is unique because His Person is unique, and that value becomes effectual in our lives only if we rightly apprehend His Person. Therefore the Church did but do its duty when it attempted to set forth the true nature of His Person.

X.

Thus far we have been concerned with the doctrine of the uniformity of Nature—with the first of the three conceptions which some would make regulative for Christian thought. Let us now turn to the second of those conceptions—to the conception of the Continuity of History.

What is meant by the continuity of history? It may mean either or both of two things:

(1) That human history is an uninterrupted process of 'natural' becoming—that every historical event is 'naturally' caused;

(2) That history is 'all of a piece'—that in every field of history similar psychological factors are similarly active.

1. If we accept the first of these meanings, and believe

the doctrine we thus define, we must believe that the only spiritual factors in history are those which have their ground in human nature ; we must deny that God exists, or believe Him to be as idle as the gods of Epicurus ; we must reject not only every thought of revelation, but also every thought of Divine influence upon the heart and mind of man—all that Mr. Balfour denotes by the word ' inspiration.'

But as thus defined the doctrine of continuity pertains to philosophy rather than to history. It implies a conception of the world which cannot be derived from history, and an interpretation of the world which cannot be proven by history. Its foundations are elsewhere than in the science of history, and it is not presupposed by the methods of that science. It is essentially speculative, and on speculative grounds we reject it. We cannot *prove* that the course of history is influenced by God, but we believe that it is, and we have good reasons for our belief. Had we not, it would be necessary to re-examine the very foundations of our Theism. If the doctrine of continuity be inconsistent with the belief that God has, everywhere and in all ages, touched the hearts and minds of men, quickening men to thoughts and deeds which without Him had not been—if it be inconsistent with this belief, we decisively and finally reject it. But in rejecting it we shall not reject anything important for the science of history, because the conception as defined by the meaning we reject is not a principle of that science or an instrument of its method.

2. It is only as defined by the second of our two suggested meanings that the conception is actually instrumental to scientific method. The scientific historian does undoubtedly presuppose (as a working hypothesis, not as a speculative doctrine) 'that history is "all of a piece"—that in every field of history similar psychological factors are similarly active'; and with this presupposition we have no quarrel. It does not touch 'origin,' but only 'mode of operation.' It tells us nothing more startling than this—that history is not *cloisonné*, that human nature is everywhere the same, and, as disclosed within the historical period, has certain

characteristics which may not unreasonably be called permanent, although they are undoubtedly variable.

From this the Christian apologist of to-day will rarely be tempted to dissent. Why, then, do men regard the conception as so important? Because of the distinction at one time made between sacred and profane history; not because a distinction was, in fact, made, but because of the nature of the distinction made. Theologians did not always recognize that the Divine influence upon history—through the consciences and minds of men—is a universal influence, and, whatever the provinces of history within which they believed it to be actual, they believed that it therein determined human nature to unique modes of operation. They had not a clear conception of human personality, of the essential truth that man is normally self-determined and acts according to his nature. They thought of the Divine influence upon man as though it were the putting of a Divine ‘something’ into man, a ‘something’ which would always act in ways manifestly Divine, receiving no limitation, suffering no detracting, from the nature wherein it acts. We now think differently. We believe the Divine influence upon man to be ordinarily not an intrusion into human nature and a supersession of its characteristics, but a quickening of that nature. We believe man’s action under that influence to be a reaction to it, and that reaction to be always according to the characteristic laws and powers of human nature. No injustice will be done to either conception if, intending only to indicate characteristic tendencies, we call the one ‘mechanical’ and the other ‘psychological.’

These different conceptions of the Divine action are associated with different conceptions of history. The former makes history discontinuous; for, according to it, men who are moved by God move, not according to their own natures, but according to His—according to the unmodified Divine impulse. Within the field of the Divine operation men act otherwise than they ordinarily do—they are determined *ab extra*, and are instruments rather than personal agents. Inspiration is verbal, and prophecy a real fore-

telling of the future. Because of all this, sacred history is a thing apart; not an aspect of the world's general history, but a separate province of history, distinguished by unique activities, and within that province the characteristic note of the Divine action is an unqualified inerrancy. On the other hand, the psychological conception naturally leads us to think of history as continuous. Human history is the history of human action, and, according to the psychological conception, it is a continuous history because man—however various the stimuli which move him to action—always acts and reacts according to the laws and constitution of his own nature.

'According to the laws and constitution of his own nature,' but not always as that nature would prompt if unaided. We believe that God has always been active in the world's history; we are slow to think that His action is ever ineffectual, we cannot think that it is ever purposeless. What, then, is the purpose of God? what the final cause of His creation? We believe that His purpose is an ethical purpose, a purpose to be accomplished in human hearts and lives; we believe that the end constituted by that purpose is the final cause of His creation and of His sustaining Providence. These beliefs are essential in our Theism, which has its ground in our ideals and the unaccomplished purpose which they indicate. But if the purpose of God be ethical, the marks of His action will also be ethical. His action may variously quicken men, making of one a prophet, of another an evangelist, of another a discoverer of spirits, of another an interpreter of tongues—'dividing to every man severally as He will'—but in every case the gift of God has an ethical mission.

Pride may not recognize the gift, and may think the new power its own; but the 'honest and good heart' always recognizes the visitation of God, and uses His gift reverently, always with a *Non nobis Domine*, because 'it is God which worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure.' The heart thus visited knows immediately that the strength of its new work is not its own, but we—who see but the resultant work, not the originating gift—can only infer the

presence of a Divine co-efficient. And we infer it—whence? Not from spoken word, not from this or that particular act, but from ethical tendency.

This mode of inference seems the more reasonable because it connects the Divine gift with the sovereign Divine purpose. If that purpose be ethical—as we believe it to be—then the characteristic notes of action instrumental thereto will also be ethical. If God's purpose in history be ethical, then His action in history will also be ethical. However various the response of men to the influence of God, however various the gifts whereby He quickens men to become co-operant with Him, the characteristic note of His presence in history will be ethical. His action is determined by His purpose, and that purpose is—what? A purpose to build that Holy City, the New Jerusalem, whereof the stones are living—a purpose to fashion for Himself a new humanity, wherein life, made perfect in Love, will be for ever His highest praise. Whatever the new forms of life and thought to which He quickens man, and whatever the relativity with which the recipient nature of man expresses and interprets the purposeful influence which quickens it, the Divine action, in proportion as it is effectual, always has one characteristic result. It strengthens the upward tendencies of history, and helps man upward, above 'the dark edges of the sensual ground,' towards his appointed end. And from results of this kind we infer the presence of God.

Nor can it be said that this inference from ethical tendency is insufficient to satisfy our religious needs. It conveys precisely the assurance which we seek—that, and no other—for it gives reasonable ground for believing that God is operant in history for an end that includes our own end. In virtue of this inference the dynamic order which constitutes the world's unity is revealed in history as a moral order, as the working out of an ethical purpose concurrent with our own.

What more do we want? Certainty?—the certainty of obvious fact? But if this were granted we would walk by sight, not by faith, and the dependence which becomes perfect in love would not be the characteristic norm of our

lives. As Bishop Butler most truly says, 'To us probability is the very guide of life.' We could, undoubtedly, infer similar assurance from a dictated text or from veridical prediction, but the inference would be more complex, less certain, and would have no greater religious value.

It should be clearly understood that no religious advantage whatever results from the older conception of the Divine action in history—from the conception which we have called 'mechanical.' For instance, if the Holy Scriptures convince us that God is effectually operant in the world towards an end in which our own characteristic end is integral, we gain nothing of religious value by supposing them to be inerrant—by supposing inspiration to be verbal and prophecy a real prediction.

SHORT NOTICES.

I.—NEW TESTAMENT.

The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel. Eight Lectures on the Morse Foundation, delivered in the Union Seminary, New York, in October and November, 1904. By WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1905.) Price 7s. 6d. net

IN recent numbers of this Review a sketch has appeared of the discussion upon the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel.¹ Since the last of these articles was returned for press, the above important work has appeared from the pen of one of our greatest scholars. To discuss it fully would involve traversing again much of the ground of the previous articles. If, therefore, our notice appears in the later section of our pages, it is from no deficient sense of the importance of Dr. Sanday's book.

The volume is, in part, a *résumé* of previous work upon the subject, setting out the various theories of the origin of the Gospel with characteristic care and sympathy. But it is much more than this. It contains also a full and comprehensive

¹ *C.Q.R.* April, July, October, 1905.

treatment of the whole problem. Dr. Sanday discusses the opinions of others, but he also makes no secret of his own. His verdict, as we rejoice to see, is on the conservative side, and it is all the stronger for the tone of judicial tolerance which pervades the whole work. Opinions which seem to us to have little indeed in their favour are not set aside or derided: full weight is given to anything that is on their side, and when rejected they are rejected deliberately and gravely. Dr. Sanday is not afraid of hitting hard when he thinks it right to do so, and his severity is the more telling from the calmness with which he considers all the questions raised and the views put forward about the Gospel. A reader of his book, therefore, should get from it a clear knowledge of the state of the problem, and a definite impression of the way in which Dr. Sanday looks for its solution.

But even this is not all: nor is this, to our mind, the chief value of the book. Everyone who has concerned himself with questions of criticism is aware that a solution of them which can fairly be called final is rarely possible. A new discovery of some lost text in an Egyptian tomb might conceivably alter the bearing of the evidence, and in various ways the estimate of the conditions of the problem might need restatement. We think, on the whole, that a serious change is highly improbable; but there is always the chance of it—always the possibility that critical problems may have to be faced again from a new point of view. Dr. Sanday, however, has done more than set out the existing state of the problem and his own view of its solution. He has entered upon the difficult and neglected ground of the principles of critical science. He has inquired not only into the historical facts relative to the Gospel, but into the logical value of the arguments drawn from them. Bishop Lightfoot's essay on 'The Silence of Eusebius' was an early and important contribution to the subject, and there have been others, notably Dr. Drummond's recent work, justly praised by Dr. Sanday; but we think that Dr. Sanday's own treatment of St. John in this book is the most successful case of a critical discussion, conducted throughout in the light of the special logic of the science. In this respect, we think, the work is of exceptional importance: it ought to have a real and traceable effect in subsequent discussion, and dispel for good a number of tiresome old fallacies.

Having said thus much of the importance and value of this book, we propose now to take our courage in both hands and to offer some criticism upon one or two points which arise in it.

One of the standing difficulties found by critics in the Gospel is the want of development in its teaching. The Messianic character of the Lord and even some of the deeper truths about Him seem, in the Fourth Gospel, to have been recognized by some from the beginning. Dr. Sanday was, of course, obliged to consider this point. He shews clearly enough that there are traces of a development parallel to that of the Synoptists (pp. 162-5), and he gives a very interesting account of the use of the word 'believe' in St. John's Gospel. With this we are cordially in sympathy. It seems to us clear that when (as in ii. 11) St. John says, 'His disciples believed on Him' he means to mark a decisive step in their appreciation of the Master's character, rather than to assert that they realized suddenly all that was true about Him.' Two sermons at the beginning of Canon Scott Holland's book *Creed and Character* seem to us to express the truth admirably.

But when we come to the 'anticipated confessions' we do not feel that Dr. Sanday is quite so convincing as before. In the first chapter, the Baptist is represented as saying on two occasions as Jesus approached, 'Behold the Lamb of God': in the first case adding 'that taketh away the sin of the world.' This is undoubtedly a remarkable phrase, and there is nothing parallel to it in the Synoptic account of the Baptist's teaching. Dr. Sanday is quite clear that if it should prove impossible to believe that this (or some other things) happened exactly as reported, our inference from other considerations to the Johannine authorship would not be decisively impugned. The question is one of historical probability and of psychological consistency. Personally, we find it difficult to believe here in the operation of the 'interpretative function' of the Evangelist. The Baptist was a prophet, as Dr. Sanday truly notes, and is represented in all our authorities 'as predicting the coming greatness of his successor' (p. 159). Dr. Sanday then proceeds: 'But it was one thing to feel a dim presentiment of a mission higher than his own, and another thing to predict for that mission at the very outset a form which it did indeed actually take, but which it seems impossible that anything should have suggested at the moment.' We should venture to ask here: Why must the presentiment have been so dim, and why is the phrase impossible at the moment? The analogy of the older prophets does not, we think, suggest either of these ideas. The prophets who lived under the kingdom thought of the Messianic time as a glorious and eternal reign of a King ruling in righteousness.

The later Isaiah under the Captivity realizes the significance of the Servant who suffers for others besides himself. Why may not the preacher of repentance have seen in his greater successor one who would remove the sin of the world? If he did this, he would but be doing what his predecessors had done: he would be assigning to the Messiah the satisfaction of the critical need of his own age. Some such view as this seems to us more probable historically than that offered by Dr. Sanday. And besides this, we venture to think it more accurately consistent with the Evangelist's method. Dr. Sanday justly points to the fact that St. John himself (ii. 22) 'distinguished between 'the word as originally spoken, and the sense he was led to put 'upon it' (p. 159). But this deliberate avowal seems to us to imply that he was less rather than more likely to have made confusion unconsciously. It suggests that he was a good witness who knew the difference between his observations and subsequent reflexions upon them. Moreover, the whole scene survives in his memory with the intensest vividness. It is surely difficult to believe—as a mere matter of psychology—that the casual half-intelligible phrases of the dialogue, and the recollection of the time of day are vivid touches of an eye-witness, while the startling phrase which sent him after the new Prophet resulted from 'imperceptibly filling out with all the full religious significance of the lamb' a mere comparison. As we think that the literal truth of the narrative is more probable historically, so we think that it is more consistent with the character and method of the narrator.

A second point as to which we do not wholly follow Dr. Sanday is that of the existence of a second John—not the Apostle—to whom the authorship of the Gospel may be assigned. As conceived by Dr. Sanday, such a second John would be a disciple, but not one of the Twelve: a close friend of the Lord and one who would speak with the fullest knowledge of the events which he describes. He would probably be younger than any of the Apostles, and for that or some other unknown reason would not have been entrusted with the task of an Apostle. Thus, if Dr. Sanday's suggestions were accepted, we should still have to treat the Gospel as the work of a thoroughly competent and well-informed eye-witness, but we should no longer say that his name was John, son of Zebedee. It is important to emphasize this point, because it distinguishes Dr. Sanday's idea of a possible second John very widely from that of some other critics. For Harnack, for instance, the advantage of the second John is

that it separates the Gospel from the immediate *entourage* of the Lord, and leads to the lower view of its historic value, which on other grounds seems to him desirable. In Dr. Sanday's view the Gospel stands very much where it was before as regards historic value. The question then arises, what purpose does the conjecture serve, and what evidence is there to justify it? We venture to think that the slightness of the evidence in its favour, and the comparatively small difficulties which it meets, render it quite unnecessary. We may safely say that the suggestion would not have been made if it had not been for the two Johns mentioned in the well-known passage of Papias, and the tradition, of which the evidence is both late and dubious, that John, son of Zebedee, was killed by the Jews.

But Dr. Sanday further calls attention (p. 105) to the fact that some of our 'best authorities . . . abstain from expressions which would identify him [the beloved disciple] with the son of Zebedee.' We venture to think that this fact points rather in the direction of the traditional identification. It is clear that the authorities gave the Evangelist the name of John. Dr. Sanday himself agrees that the John of the Acts and Galatians was the Apostle, the son of Zebedee: and that the Acts of John, a second-century work, without any ambiguity identifies the Evangelist with the son of Zebedee. In the Acts of John this identification, though unambiguous, is indirect: that is, John the Apostle at Ephesus and James are spoken of as brothers, as having been at the Transfiguration, and so on; the term 'son of Zebedee' is not added as though there were another John requiring to be distinguished from the Apostle. We submit that the absence of the special phrases in Irenæus and others is due to the fact that they knew of only one John prominent in the early history of the Church, and did not distinguish him by special phrases because there was no need. Scriptural usage in similar cases supplies a parallel. John the Baptist is always unmistakably identified in the Gospels. In the Fourth Gospel he appears simply as John; in the Synoptists after the death of the Baptist, John means the Apostle, the son of Zebedee; the possibility of a further confusion is avoided in the Acts by the phrase 'John, surnamed Mark.' So, again, St. Luke tells us that James, brother of John, was slain with the sword: after this James means the brother of the Lord, and needs no precise identification. We think, therefore, that the lack of identifying phrases points towards, rather than away from, the traditional identification:

that the usage of St. Luke suggests that no other John of importance in the Church was known to him, or to the Church of his day, except the son of Zebedee, and John Mark. Hence the hypothesis of the existence of another introduces serious confusion into the most trustworthy parts of our evidence. The tradition of John's death at an early date is so imperfectly based and uncertain that it cannot stand against the coherent evidence on the other side. To reconstruct the history to suit it, would surely be a case of 'arguing on the strength of a few particulars in the face of clear and decisive indications' (p. 63).

There is a third point upon which we think it desirable to say something, because it cannot fail to excite discussion when it is noticed: we mean Dr. Sanday's language about the supernatural element in the Gospel. Dr. Sanday maintains in no uncertain tone that St. John's 'descriptions of the supernatural always start from facts that had come under his own personal observation, or that of others who were very near to him' (p. 102). This is an important statement, and must be borne in mind in any discussion of the subject. In the section headed 'Method of approaching the Question of Miracle,' Dr. Sanday lays stress on the evidence for miracles, and the strength of conviction with which the belief in them was held. And then he tells us that the question raised by this supernatural element is not 'so much What is the absolute reality of what happened? as How should we describe it—we, with our twentieth-century habits of thought and improved scientific categories?' (p. 175). A little further on he refers (p. 180) to the description of the efflux of blood and water. 'Physicians,' he then proceeds

'tell us that what the Evangelist actually saw was not, strictly and literally, what he has described. The efflux from the side was not exactly blood and water, though it might quite well have had an appearance like that of blood and water, and the Evangelist no doubt supposed it to be what he says . . . Clearly here it is permissible to distinguish between the fact itself for which we have this explicit testimony, and the train of speculation to which it gave rise' (p. 181).

We have, therefore, in this case a physical event, fully intelligible within the region of physical law, to which the Evangelist has given an interpretation of a mystical kind, starting from the appearance which reached his eyes. Dr. Sanday carefully guards himself against the charge of arguing from this to other cases: 'I do not wish at all to imply—I desire expressly to guard myself

against implying—that other miracles in the Fourth Gospel can be explained so simply as that of the pierced side' (p. 182). It is important, therefore, to avoid pressing his language. At the same time, we think it right to say that we do not, for our own part, think that this line of explanation is at all hopeful in the case of the majority of the New Testament miracles.

In the first place, while we may be clear as to the twentieth-century attitude to certain things, it is very important in dealing with the New Testament writers to be sure that we are clear as to *their* attitude. Are we sure that St. John treated this event as miraculous? Whatever he thought about it, we may question whether he could have spoken of it in any other terms than those he uses. He does not treat the efflux itself as miraculous in the Gospel. The point in which the events before him serve to fulfil prophecy has nothing to do with the efflux. And in the passage in the Epistle (I John v. 6) which seems to have some connexion with the event in question he emphasizes the blood, 'This is he that came through water and blood, Jesus Christ: not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood.' It is not clear that this obscure passage implies some such thought as this as its major premiss: the miraculous sign upon the cross shews the necessity of the blood as well as the water. We doubt whether St. John would have placed this event on the same level, for instance, as the Resurrection. But, secondly, we seriously doubt whether, in regard to some miraculous events, there can be the same sort of difference between our way of describing them and that of St. John—if, as Dr. Sanday argues, they took place at all. Take such a case as the miracle at Cana. St. John describes a series of facts: the failure of the supply of wine, the empty water-pots, the filling of them with water, and then the production of wine either from the pots themselves, or from the spring from which they had been replenished with water. It is conceivable that 'improved scientific categories' may render the change less startling than it appears: that is, that it may break it up, as it were, into a series or chain of changes. That would leave St. John's account unaltered. He says that what began as water became wine at Christ's word, and it would make no difference to this if we became able to name some of the intermediate stages of the process. But the character of the narrative would be completely subverted if the Evangelist was mistaken in thinking either that the substance poured into the pots was water, or that that which was offered to the ruler

of the feast was wine. In like manner the story of Lazarus is altered in character if his condition was

but a case of mania—subinduced
By epilepsy, at the turning point
Of trance prolonged unduly—some three days.

We have ventured to mention a few points as to which we differ from Dr. Sanday. But we do not wish to leave the impression that we are at variance with him on a large scale. The book is, as we have already said, a most important and valuable contribution to the problem of the Fourth Gospel, and we think that Dr. Sanday deserves the sincere thanks of all scholars and all Christians for writing it.

II.—LECTURES AND SERMONS.

The Gospel and Human Life. Sermons by ALFRED AINGER, M.A., LL.D., late Master of the Temple and Canon Residentiary of Bristol. (London: Macmillan and Co, 1904.) Price 6s.

It was well in every way that this selection of sermons should be published while many of us are trying to form some sort of conception of the totality of the late Canon Ainger's many-sided nature, and at the same time to come to understand how its various elements were brought into so happy a harmony with one another. It was also well that the selection should be made and introduced, in a few words of excellent taste and true critical insight, by a friend—Canon Beeching—in praise of whose preface nothing need be said but that Ainger could not have wished a word added to it or a word taken away. We all like success, and there was no reason why Ainger should not have been gratified by the knowledge that sequences of his sermons, as the writer can testify, filled Bristol Cathedral with a responsive audience; while of the Temple Church, in the course of years, he seemed to have become as organic a part as the musical services which he cherished. Nor can there be any doubt that his preaching was admirably adapted to the real needs of the nucleus of his Temple congregation, while attractive to the large influx of occasional visitors, of whose more or less adventitious character he never made any secret to these audiences themselves. A polite eighteenth-century poet asserted that 'the Temple Church needs Sherlock's strength and wit'; but Ainger divined that the lawyers who came so steadily to hear him were in want not so much of intellectual stimulus as, consciously or not, of spiritual refreshment. The modesty of his self-judgement, which to those who loved him was his supreme personal charm, was so closely allied to his reverent recognition of the power

which he defined as faith, that these pulpit utterances, slight as they may appear to some, and free as they almost uniformly are from any trace of effort in the direction of eloquence or stylistic effect, speak very directly to the large congregation with whom the remembrance of him survives.

To the author of these sermons Christianity was no complicated system of dogma, still less a formal structure of observances elaborated out of such a system. But its dogmatic basis was not the less, in his view, as indispensable as it was sure; and the whole of the earlier—and perhaps the most striking—of the contents of this volume seem to turn on the futility of seeking to dispense with it. Such is, in particular, not merely the drift, but the clear purpose, of the sermon on 'The Decay of Worship'—which is explained to mean the change (so deceptive to many who allow it to overtake them) in the attitude of men to Christ—'not as a man and the noblest of men, but as the satisfier of men's wants, the healer of their woes, the Saviour from their sins, the one source of their conquest over death.' Ainger's convinced adherence to this 'theological' conception of the relation of the Christian to Christ imparts a solemnity beyond his words to his warning to 'young men who are taught that they may abstain from worship, and expend their energies more profitably in helping their fellow-men.' And a singularly beautiful—for once, too, a singularly bold—illustration of this teaching of the necessity of submission is supplied in the sermon on 'The Honour that Cometh from God Only,' where the import of the Saviour's saying, 'I can of mine own self do nothing,' is shewn to cover the whole field of human conduct.

Very possibly other readers of this volume may find themselves more specially impressed by not a few passages in it which directly bear out Canon Beeching's tribute to the preacher's vivid interest in human character, and to his keen observation and shrewd judgement of motive and disposition. They will readily turn to the interesting discourse on Judas; perhaps, also, to that on Gallio; hardly to that on Wiclif, which was hardly worth including with the rest. But the informing spirit of Ainger's preaching is not to be sought in these more or less occasional commentaries. He would have shrunk from speaking of himself as charged with a message of his own, but he must have felt in his soul that he could speak, with the kind of force which is rarely exercised unconsciously, to those who, as he says in his sermon on Nicodemus, 'would fain come to Jesus "by night," because they fear the criticism of those with whom they move by day.' Some such, at least, must have listened to him, and some may not have listened in vain.

Common Thoughts on Serious Subjects. By CHESTER MACNAGHTEN.
New and revised edition. (London: Unit Library, 1904.) 2s. 6d. net.

THE name of Ranjitsinhji is familiar to us all, and the collection of addresses by his gifted headmaster, Chester Macnaghten, first Principal of the Rajkumar College of Kathiawar, India, which now appears in a second edition, should appeal to all who are interested in the British Empire in India. An appreciative account is given of Mr. Macnaghten in the introduction by a Rugby master, Robert Whitelaw, his Cambridge contemporary and intimate friend. The college was founded for the education of the young chiefs of Kathiawar, a district jutting out into the Indian Ocean north-west of Bombay. The task at first presented difficulties, some great, some amusing. 'Even when the most enlightened of the chiefs began one by one to send their boys, the young nobles were attended each by a tail of retainers armed to the teeth. Their kinsmen and vassals insisted on mounting guard all night outside the apartments of the heirs-apparent, lest they should be murdered by the followers of rival houses. Each boy had also a Polonius to advise him, an influence that often thwarted the discipline of the college, and kept his lady-mother in a fever of anxiety by daily letters home' (p. xvii).

The addresses deal with such subjects as 'The Presence of God,' 'Faith,' 'Prayer,' 'Kindness to Animals,' 'Personal Influence,' 'Unselfishness,' &c. The new edition is printed more elegantly than the first, and is accompanied by a good index. Its contents are practically the same, except that one address has been left out, and one on 'Zeal' included, together with two fragments. We are sorry, however, to miss in this edition the two pictures, one of the college group of 1887, the other of the 'Rajkumar College at Rajkot.' It would also be interesting to know whether the college still continues successfully on the lines laid down by Mr. Macnaghten.

The treatment of the topics is not markedly original, but the addresses are interesting, partly because of the high tone and devotion to duty which breathe through them, and partly because they are enlivened with literary parallels and pieces of general knowledge or local colouring which would appeal to the audience. As instances of this we may select the reference with which the essay on Duty ends (p. 18) to Leigh Hunt's poem 'Abou ben Adhem,' or the story of Sabuktagin and the Doe, in the address on 'Kindness to Animals,' (p. 67), or the description of the great banyan on the Nerbudda in 'Flowers of the Field' (p. 77).

There are one or two quaint touches here and there, e.g. in 'Manners' (p. 188), 'All spitting in public places, all noises of the

nose and throat . . . are to be avoided as acts of bad manners.' Again, in 'Truth : in deed' (p. 25), 'If you take leave from me to go out riding, and having such leave go into the bazaar, to a place which you know I have forbidden . . . you have acted a lie.'

Mr. Macnaghten was forbidden to teach these boys Christianity. How did he touch their hearts to get hold of them? The following extracts will help to answer this question. 'It is a common saying that everything comes to him who waits. But more things come to him who works. So let us work and despair not' (p. xxiv). 'We all come to see as we grow older that nothing in life is worth living for but work for our fellow-men, and the higher the work the higher the happiness' (p. xxv). 'We all hope to live hereafter with God, and to be holy as He is holy. Shall we not strive to be holy here, and ask Him to help us in all our endeavours? That is the meaning of all our religions' (p. xxvii). 'I have no hesitation in saying that the natural religion of every man is the religion of his home : for religion is naturally a matter of the heart, and every man's heart is in his home' (p. xxxi).

Innocents' Day Addresses, delivered in Westminster Abbey. By GEORGE GRANVILLE BRADLEY, sometime Dean of Westminster. (London : Murray.) Price 6s. net.

The School of Faith. Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey. By the Right Rev. BISHOP WELLDON, D.D. (London : Bemrose.) Price 3s. 6d.

Sermons preached in St. Edmund's College Chapel on Various Occasions. Collected and arranged by EDWIN BURTON, Vice-President. (London : Burns and Oates.) Price 5s.

THE delight which the late Dean of Westminster's *Innocents' Day Addresses* gave when delivered in the Abbey is well remembered ; their obvious use, as now printed, is to be read in the children's hour by the drawing-room fire, and generations of mothers so using them will rise up and call their author blessed. There is, by the way, a curious mistake, which should have been corrected. Charles II. is credited with ten children dead in their infancy and laid in the Stuart vault. It should be James II.

For Dr. Welldon's volume there is equal justification. His sermons have the great merit of being sermons and nothing else. They are marked by that directness of appeal, passing at times into brusqueness, which was the strength of Mr. Spurgeon's preaching. To use a distinction drawn by Mr. Gladstone, the preacher addresses himself not to his subject but to his hearers. He does not preach

about the doctrine of the Holy Trinity : he preaches God, Three in One. He does not preach about the Virgin birth : he preaches Jesus Christ, the unique, the Virgin-born. Many such sermons, no doubt, are preached, but few are printed. The best of uses awaits these ; they may be taken as a model for young preachers.

Our third volume is of a wholly different character. These discourses, delivered in the chapel of St. Edmund's College, Ware, have as little of the sermon about them as anything bearing the name can well have. Some are funeral orations, others are academic *conciones*, others panegyrics of the patron saint. They range from the sermon preached by Cardinal Wiseman at the consecration of the chapel in 1853, to the oration delivered at the thirteenth centenary of St. Gregory the Great in 1904. All are marked by a certain stiffness. Manning speaks here in his cast-iron style on the unction of the Holy One, proclaiming the needlessness of 'human teachers, Scribe or Pharisee, disputer or philosopher.' The Benedictine Bishop of Newport discourses with a characteristic simplicity and piety on the need of learning in the Church : 'For in the Catholic Church learning is not an ornament, or an amusement, or a luxury, but it is a necessity.' He honestly laments the lack of it among those of his own communion in England during the last hundred years. He is better pleased with the state of religion during the three centuries that elapsed between the death of St. Edmund in 1240 and the 'national apostasy' of 1536, 'when,' he says, 'religious calm prevailed in England.' He forgets, however, to enumerate the men of learning who continuously adorned the English Church during that period. His colleague in the pulpit, Mgr. Vassall-Phillips, essays a bolder flight in history, telling the students at Ware that in the days of their patron saint 'it was not even as yet the age of the scholastics. St. Edmund lived before the Master of the Sentences had begun to write or lecture.' How such a statement could be made or passed by the editor it is hard to understand. Peter Lombard died in or about 1160 ; Edmund Rich was born in 1179. But it is not a matter of a bare date. What did the preacher make of St. Edmund's academic life ?

III.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

Andrew Marvell. By AUGUSTINE BIRRELL. 'English Men of Letters.' New Series. (London : Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1905.) Price 2s. net.

MOST readers have their established favourites, and critics are happily not always in agreement as to their literary standards ; but there is some ground for the complaint that, without the specious excuse of the publishers of 'Johnson's *Poets*' the authorities responsible for the 'English Men of Letters,' of the new series are becoming 'arbitrary,' in the way of the late Mr. John Forster. Oddly enough, an instance of this tendency to waywardness is furnished by the monograph now before us. And yet Andrew Marvell could hardly have been more fortunate than in having 'cause shown' on his behalf by an advocate far too clever to overstate his case, while lighting it up with a wit which, like Marvell's own, has been proof against a prolonged experience of the House of Commons. Who would deny Mr. Birrell's contention that as a poet Marvell has his 'glorious,' or at least his supremely felicitous, moments ; that it is impossible to read without a thrill that couplet in his *Poem upon the Death of his late Highness the Protector*, which makes us petty men kin with the great dead :

O, human glory vain ! O, death ! O, wings !
O, worthless world ! O, transitory things !

and that no English poet—certainly none of his age—is more successful than he 'in creating the impression that his verses' about 'gardens and woods, meads and rivers and birds,' were not copies from books or reflections from other poets, great or small, but 'made out of doors' ? Yet, when these and a few similar tributes have been paid, what remains to justify his inclusion among the masters of English verse ? His versified satire, though containing much that is forcible even in a writer belonging to an age when there went a great deal of expression to ill-nature, undoubtedly not only makes many palpable hits, but is now and then dignified by visitations of the true spirit of satire ; the great body of it, however, stands outside poetic literature. As for his prose, Mr. Birrell is no doubt right in his repeated conjecture that Swift was well acquainted with Marvell's pamphlets, and his bipartite *magnum opus* in particular ; and as a literary study they cannot but interest us as a transition from Milton, though the other side of the bridge seems a long

G G 2

way off, when it was really close at hand. His efforts as an annalist, in the service of his parliamentary constituents, are wholesomely devoid of literary fascination. Thus the main part of Mr. Birrell's task would have been a biography of Marvell outside his work as a man of letters, had only enough been known of his personal history to make such a biography possible. Indeed, it is difficult to form any distinct notion of him, except in a few passages in his life, of which the most startling is certainly that of a *fracas*—actual or supposed—in the House of Commons, when, confessing that he seldom spoke in the House, he had to labour through a tortuous apology for a ridiculous breach of order. Mr. Birrell's quality as a critic preserves him all but uniformly from lapsing into a 'may have been'; but, on the other hand, the texture of his own narrative occasionally comes dangerously near to that of a newsletter, and, skilled artist as he is, he now and then, among facts about Ireland and Poleroons, almost makes us forget whose life he is writing.

As a study in political history, on the other hand, Mr. Birrell's *Marvell* is valuable as a singularly judicious presentment of a type far more characteristic of the age of Charles II. than is at times supposed. Notwithstanding Thomas Baker, Marvell was as Mr. Birrell shews, the reverse of a 'bitter republican,' and it is no arduous task to gauge the depth of the loyalty towards the Crown which animated the author of 'the best of all the King's Speeches' that were ever written. But he was not afraid of giving full-bodied utterance to all the passions and most of the prejudices of an English patriot; and although he blundered about the Popish Plot, he saw clearly into the meaning of the great conspiracy against English Protestantism. This type of political conviction withstood the corruptions of Charles II.'s *régime* without difficulty, just as the vile seductions of his Court glanced off harmlessly from high-minded feminine virtue. Neither our political nor our social life was rotten to the core.

We should be sorry to mar the effect of the *malices* and other vivacities with which this little volume abounds, especially in its earlier pages, by detaching them from their surroundings; and we are bound to say that for the most part these sallies are in finer taste than the gibes against Sir Gilbert Scott, Dr. Grosart (to whose weaknesses the time has come for being 'a little blind'), and 'parsons' wives' in general, *à propos* of nothing in particular. To end with one or two very minute cavils. The

graduates mentioned in the Conclusion Book of Trinity College, Cambridge, under September 1641, must have been not doctors but 'domini'; and Magdalene College in the same University claims a final 'e.' The 'noble east window' in Peterhouse Chapel is not a thing of the past.

Samuel Richardson. By AUSTIN DOBSON. 'English Men of Letters' Series. (London: Macmillan, 1902.) Price 2s. net.

MR. AUSTIN DOBSON is singularly well fitted to be the biographer of an eighteenth-century author. He is steeped in the literature of that age and in full sympathy with it; he has the necessary patience for investigating the sources of information, and insight enough to make full use of them; and he has an efficient, quiet style which leaves the biographer in the background, while concentrating our attention upon his subject. It can have been no light task to read through, not only the six volumes of Richardson's correspondence published by Mrs. Barbauld in 1804, but also many other unpublished letters which are now in the South Kensington Museum; but this has been done, and many side-lights have been thrown upon the letters from other sources. The result is to make a readable book out of a very uneventful life. In truth, neither the life nor the author himself (apart from his books) was specially interesting; but what is intensely interesting is the fact that a man of his antecedents and intellectual characteristics should have been the writer of two masterpieces of English fiction. One expects to find something unusual or abnormal in the life of an artist. But that a quiet business man, of imperfect education, of methodical habits and domestic tastes, who had had but little to do with literature during the first fifty years of his life, should then, in the space of two months, write an imaginative work which made him immediately famous in England and in France, would sound incredible if it were not true. Nor should we have expected that the rigid moralist, who did sincerely wish to benefit his readers, would have written passages which offended the delicate sense of the French public; nor that the father of English novel-writers, with so much virgin soil before him to cultivate, should have selected so unusual and unconventional a subject as that of *Clarissa*.

Richardson evidently took himself very seriously, and he was surrounded by a circle of admiring young ladies whose flatteries could not but increase his self-importance, estimable and steady as he was. His characters were treated by himself and his friends as really existing outside the books; and he went so far as to publish in a separate volume the pious exercises which had consoled *Clarissa*

in her misfortunes. His relations with Fielding were characteristic ; he seems to have resented, not only (what might reasonably have offended him) the introduction of his Pamela's family into *Joseph Andrews*, and the caricature 'Shamela Andrews' which he believed Fielding to have written, but also (and even more) the popularity of *Tom Jones*. It has been suggested that it was this rivalry which induced him when he was over sixty years of age to set to work on *Sir Charles Grandison*, the last, and possibly the most widely read, of his works. The remainder of his life was spent quietly and comfortably among a circle of estimable friends, who were perhaps (as Mr. Dobson says) scarcely the illustrious body that he believed them to be.

Rossetti. By ARTHUR 'C. BENSON. 'English Men of Letters.' (Macmillan and Co., 1904.) Price 2s. net.

THIS book is marked by the two characteristics most needed in writing the life of Rossetti—appreciation and reserve. In a memoir of one poet written by another poet, we are prepared for the first of these two merits, but it speaks a great deal for the skill and taste of the writer that he has been able to combine it with the second. Mr. Benson has a genuine admiration for his hero without being blind to his faults : he tells us enough to enable us to understand the fine nature of the man, and enough to shew how his defects dimmed, without obliterating, his essential nobility of mind ; and he does this without spoiling the unity of his portrait by too great an insistence on details.

Rossetti was a man of extraordinary literary and artistic genius, and was hardly less remarkable for the inconsistencies of his mind and character, and the limitations of his tastes and interests. He was of a generous, affectionate disposition, capable of feeling and inspiring strong attachments ; but he was often inconsiderate and selfish in his daily intercourse with his friends, and was a keen bargainer for his pictures. Intellectually he was a giant, dominating those with whom he came into contact, and quite in the first rank as a conversationalist and a letter-writer ; yet there were wide mental tracts which he left entirely unvisited. It was not merely Christian theology which meant nothing to him ; he was almost equally indifferent to the claims of philosophy, history, politics, and science. In nationality, he was by birth mainly Italian, and he shewed his Italian origin by the warmth of his colouring—both in pictures and in poems. Yet he never visited Italy. He had a complete mastery over the English language, and liked to express himself colloquially in the plain vernacular. In art, he began life with an eager protest against convention and in favour of sincerity, but he ended by becoming a mannerist.

In religion, he was an agnostic; but he had a strong imaginative conception of the supernatural, and a decided belief in personal survival. It was difficult to lay before the reader a coherent account of a man such as this; but Mr. Benson has succeeded in doing it, and we are grateful to him.

If we except a few rather careless sentences, which shew signs of undue haste, the book is excellently written, and there are some passages which rise to eloquence—as, for instance, when Mr. Benson says that to read of the enthusiasts of the Pre-Raphaelite period is ‘like listening to young and careless voices breaking the stillness of the morning air in some enchanted landscape of falling streams and dewy thickets.’

It is perhaps a pity that more is not made of the relation between Rossetti and his illustrious sister Christina; for it was a relation of affection and confidence most honourable to both, and there can be no doubt that the high poetic faculty of each stimulated the other.

PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. VII. No. 25. October 1905. H. Frowde). A. H. McNeile: ‘The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood.’ In reply to Prof. Kennett (*J.T.S.* Jan. 1905). F. C. Burkitt: ‘Aphraates and Monasticism.’ In reply to Dom Connolly (July 1905). J. H. A. Hart: ‘Apollon.’ E. J. Kylie: ‘The Condition of the German Provinces as illustrating the Methods of St. Boniface.’ G. St. Clair: ‘The Subtle Serpent.’ W. O. E. Oesterley: ‘Codex Taurinensis (Y), II. Greek Text of Hosea. G. Morin: ‘La Témoignage perdu de Jean Évêque de Tours sur les Hérésies de Nestorius et d’Eutychès.’ A fragment from MS. Bodl. Laud. Misc. 92. C. H. Turner: ‘The *Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum* attributed to Gennadius.’ Latin text. E. S. Buchanan: ‘The Codex Corbeiensis (ff), I.’ E. Bishop: ‘The Litany of Saints in the Stowe Missal.’ A. Condamin: ‘Symmetrical Repetitions in Lamentations, I., II.’ H. W. Sheppard: ‘Note on the word *Ebhväh*, Gen. xlix. 7.’ A. Souter: ‘Patristica.’ Notices many important works.

The Expositor (Nos. LXX.—LXXII. October–December 1905. Hodder and Stoughton). A. E. Garvie: ‘Studies in the “Inner Life” of Jesus: XII. The Limitation of Knowledge’; XIII. (December) ‘The Causes of Offence.’ N. J. D. White: ‘The Revealing of the Trinity.’ W. H. Bennett: ‘The Life of Christ according to St. Mark’ (*continued*). G. Jackson: ‘The Ethical Teaching of St. Paul: (9) Cases of Conscience; (10, November) Anger and the Self-assertive Virtues.’ W. M. Ramsay: ‘Iconium’ (*continued*, also November). G. Adam Smith: ‘Manasseh’s Jerusalem c. 690–640 B.C.’; (November) ‘Jerusalem and Deuteronomy, c. 638–608 B.C.’ November. J. H. A. Hart: ‘The Lord reigned from the Tree.’ Ps. xcvi. (xcvi.) 10. G. G. Findlay: ‘Studies in I. John’ (*continued*). December. B. W. Bacon: ‘Again the Authorship of the Last Verses of Mark.’ H. J. Gibbins: ‘The Problem of II. John.’ W. M. Ramsay: ‘The Christian Inscriptions of Lycaonia.’ J. de Zwaan: ‘The Text and Exegesis of Mark xiv. 41 and the Papyri.’

The Hibbert Journal (Vol. IV. No. 1. October 1905. Williams and Norgate). M. Anesaki: 'How Christianity appeals to a Japanese Buddhist.' L. P. Jacks: 'Is the Moral Supremacy of Christendom in Danger?' H. Jones: 'The Working Faith of the Social Reformer.' P. T. Forsyth: 'Authority and Theology.' J. Ward: 'Mechanism and Morals: the World of Science and the World of History.' Sir O. Lodge: 'Life: a Hypothesis and Two Analogies.' C. T. Ovenden: 'Thought and Force.' J. E. McTaggart: 'The Inadequacy of certain common Grounds of Belief.' E. Lyttelton: 'The Teaching of the Christian Religion in Public Schools.' A. H. Keane: 'The Moral Argument against the Inspiration of the Old Testament.' A. R. Gordon: 'The Religious Value of the Narratives in Genesis.' Discussions. Reviews. G. Dawes Hicks: 'J. Ward, *Naturalism and Agnosticism*, 2nd edition.' H. Jones: 'Dill, *Roman Society from Nerva to M. Aurelius*.' T. Whittaker: 'C. Read, *Metaphysics of Nature*.' J. Seth: 'J. E. Carpenter, *James Martineau, Theologian and Teacher*.' R. W. Chambers: 'A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy*.' A. Jeremias: 'Cheyne, *Bible Problems*.' B. W. Bacon: 'Gutjahr, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit des Irenäischen Zeugnisses über die Abfassung des vierten Kanonischen Evangeliums*.' J. Moffatt: 'J. T. Forbes, *Socrates*.'

The American Journal of Theology (Vol. LX. No. 4. October 1905. Chicago University Press). J. Réville: 'Anticlericalism in France.' K. Fullerton: 'A new Chapter out of the Life of Isaiah.' Discusses Is. xxii, 15-25. C. Clemen: 'The Sojourn of the Apostle John at Ephesus.' W. C. Keirstead: 'Metaphysical Presuppositions of Ritschl.' F. C. Conybeare: 'The Correspondence of Peter Mongus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, together with the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno and the Rescript of the Emperor Anastasius, now first translated from the old Armenian text.' Reviews: 'A. S. Peake, *Job*.' 'J. Hermann, *Die Idee der Sühne im A.T.*' 'H. Duhm, *Die bösen Geister im A.T.*' W. Muss-Arnolt: 'Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*.' 'K. Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium*.' 'H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea*.' 'P. Koetschau, *Beiträge zur Textkritik von Origenes' Johannescommentar*.' Important. 'C. H. W. Johns, *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters*.' Favourable. A. Jeremias: 'Babylonisches im Neuen Testament.' J. W. Bailey: 'Schermann, *Eine Elfapostelmoral oder die X-Recension der "beiden Wege"*.' A. H. Newman: 'H. von Schubert, *Der sogenannte "Praedestinatus"*: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus.' W. C. Keirstead: 'Illingworth, *Christian Character*.' Critical. E. W. Hoskins: 'Recent Books on Buddhism.'

The Princeton Theological Review (Vol. III. No. 4. October 1905. Philadelphia: MacCalla and Co.). B. B. Warfield: 'Tertullian and the Beginnings of the Doctrine of the Trinity.' R. D. Wilson: 'Royal Titles in Antiquity, VI.' G. Macloskie: 'New Light on the Old Testament.' T. F. Fotheringham: 'The Doctrine of Baptism in Holy Scripture and the Westminster Standards, II.' J. G. Machen: 'The New Testament Account of the Birth of Jesus, I.' Reviews. B. B. Warfield: 'Cheyne, *Bible Problems*.' 'Historical Theology' (notices fourteen recent books on John Knox). J. D. Davis: 'W. R. Harper, *Amos and Hosea* and *The Structure*

of the Text of Hosea.' G. Vos: 'I. F. Wood, *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature*.' C. W. Hodge: 'O. Kirn, *Grundriss der Evangelischen Dogmatik*.' A. M. Dulles: 'J. Denney and others, *Questions of Faith*.'

The Dublin Review (Vol. CXXXVII. No. 275. October 1905. Burns and Oates). F. E. Ross: 'Henry III. and the Church.' F. Aveling: 'Universals and the "Illative Sense."' A. St. L. Westall: 'Nelson and Napoleon in 1805.' H. N. Birt: 'Religious Influences in London, III.' A. B. Sharpe: 'The Conscience of Rationalism.' M. Esposito: 'Dicuil: an Irish Monk in the Ninth Century.' R. E. Francillon: 'Some Popish Traitors.' J. M. Stone: 'Joseph Goerres: his Work and his Friends.' Reviews: 'M. D. Petre, *The Soul's Orbit*.' Unfavourable. 'The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers.' 'G. Horner, *Coptic New Testament*, III., IV.' 'Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, extra volume.' 'Bishop Hall, *Christian Doctrine of Prayer*.' 'H. Rashdall, *Christus in Ecclesia*.' 'Magistretti, *Manuale Ambrosianum*.'

The Interpreter (Vol. II. No. 1. October 1905. Simpkin, Marshall). W. Sanday: 'The still small Voice of the Scriptures.' W. R. Inge: 'Sin and Modern Thought, I.' W. Emery Barnes: 'Nehemiah.' A. S. Peake: 'The Book of Jonah.' W. C. Allen: 'The Birth of Christ in the New Testament, II.' (continued from Feb. 1905). J. F. Stenning: 'A Critical Study of the Life of David, III.' (continued from May-June 1905). F. W. Orde Ward: 'Some Last Words on Miracles.' C. L. Broun: 'Protestant Criticism of the New Testament in Germany.' F. T. Woods: 'The Church and Open-Air Preaching.' Reviews: 'M. Dods, *The Bible: its Origin and Nature*.' 'A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*.' 'C. S. Loch, *Methods of Social Advance*.' 'Giles, *The Sayings of Lao-Tzu*.'

The Baptist Review and Expositor (Vol. II. No. 4. October 1905. Louisville, Ky.). C. Burrage: 'A Brief Examination of the Gould MS.' J. C. Bracq: 'The Separation of Church and State in France.' J. B. Anderson: 'The Validity of the New Testament's Discernment of Christ in the O.T.' E. Y. Mullins: 'The Theological Trend.' W. Ashmore: 'Some Characteristics of the Missionary Situation in the East.' E. C. Dargan: 'John Knox, Preacher.' L. O. Dawson: 'Gladstone as John Morley saw him.' D. F. Estes: 'H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*.' 'B. Weiss, *The Religion of the New Testament*.' A. F. Robertson: 'Ramsay, *Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*.' W. J. McGlothlin: 'Mahaffy, *Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire*.' E. C. Dargan: 'W. C. Wilkinson, *Modern Masters of Pulpit Discourse*.' 'G. A. Smith, *The Forgiveness of Sins*.' 'R. J. Campbell, *Sermons to Individuals*.' Unfavourable. G. E. Merrill: 'E. Y. Mullins, *Why is Christianity true?*'

The Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. XVIII. No. 69. October 1905. Macmillan). E. J. Worman: 'Notes on the Jews in Fustât, from Genizah Cambridge Documents.' H. S. Q. Henriques: 'The Civil Rights of English Jews.' M. N. Adler: 'The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela' (continued). L. Ginzberg: 'Geonic Responsa.' A Hebrew fragment of Hai Gaon. H. Hirschfeld: 'The Arabic Portion of the Cairo Genizah at Cambridge, XI.' S. A. Cook: 'Notes on O.T. History: II., Saul.' V. Aptowitz and H. Hirschfeld: 'Genizah Responsum XXVI. in J.Q.R.'

Jan. 1905.' A. Weiner: 'Note on Jewish Doctors in England in the Reign of Henry IV.' W. Bacher and N. Porges: 'Notes on *J.Q.R.* No. 68, pp. 615 ff.' S. A. Cook: 'R. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica* (I. Genesis-Kings)'; 'Harper, *Amos and Hosea*'; 'J. W. Thirtle, *Titles of the Psalms*, 2nd edit.'; 'W. H. Cobb, *Systems of Hebrew Metre*'; 'C. F. Kent, *Student's O.T.*, I., II.' W. Bacher: 'On the Biblical Exegesis of Joseph Ibn Kaspi.' A lengthy review of an edition by I. Last, based on MS. Bodl. Suppl. Hebr. C. 16. A. Wolf: 'L. G. Lévy, *La Métaphysique de Maimonide*'; 'S. A. Hirsch, *A Book of Essays*'; 'J. Fromer, *Das Wesen des Judentums*.' S. Poznański: 'Steinschneider, *Geschichtsliteratur der Juden in Druckwerken u. Handschriften*.' An important review. I. A[brahams]: 'Bibliography of Hebraica and Judaica (July-September 1905).'

The Expository Times (Vol. XVII. Nos. 1-3. October-December 1905. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark). 'Dr. Emil Reich on the Legends in Genesis and Exodus.' J. O. Dykes: 'The Person of Our Lord' (*continued* November, December). W. R. Morfill: 'Grass, *Die Russischen Sekten*.' J. Iverach: 'B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des A.T.*' M. C. Smith: 'A. Harnack, *Militia Christi*.' A. S. Geden: 'Johannes Avetaranian.' 'T. J. de Boer, *History of Philosophy in Islam*.' A. H. Sayce: 'C. H. Ranke, *Early Babylonian Personal Names*.' W. Taylor: 'The Reading of Holy Scripture.' Sir J. C. Hawkins: 'The Use of Dante as an Illustrator of Scripture, IV.' (December: 'Some Helps to the Study of Dante'). W. S. Fleck: 'How long was Christ in the State of the Dead?' E. Nestle: '318 = Eliezer (Gen. xiv. 14).' A. Poynder: 'The Young Lions' (Ps. xxxiv. 10). Conjectures Khäbbirim for Khéphirim. November. 'Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*.' I. Cohen: 'Modern Hebrew Literature.' G. H. Gwilliam: 'The Prophet like unto Moses.' University Sermon. M. Dods: 'A. Meyer, *Die Auferstehung Christi*.' W. A. Curtis: 'G. Mentz, *Die Wittenberger Artikel von 1536*.' J. Taylor: 'Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*. I. Genesis-Regum.' A. Plummer, *English Church History from Death of Henry VII. to Death of Archbishop Parker*. J. Baikie: 'W. M. Flinders Petrie, *History of Egypt from the XIXth to the XXXth Dynasties*.' December. R. W. Moss: 'Lütgert, *Gottes Sohn und Gottes Geist*.' J. G. Tasker: 'Resch, *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu*.' D. Purves: 'G. Ferries, *The Growth of Christian Faith*.' 'The Reading of Holy Scripture.' E. Nestle: 'Gen. xiv. 14 in the Epistle of Barnabas.' W. D. Morris: 'Arels of Moab.'

The Independent Review (Vol. VII. Nos. 25-27. October-December 1905. T. Fisher Unwin). C. R. Buxton: 'A Vision of England.' A. H. Gilkes: 'English Ideas on Education.' H. W. Garrod: 'The Religion of all Good Men.' F. J. Shaw: 'Three Nature-Books' (*Natural History of Selborne, Walden, The Story of my Heart*). E. M. Forster: 'Gemistus Pletho (1355-1450).' F. W. Hirst: 'Redlich, *Recht und Technik des englischen Parlamentarismus*.' R. Mayor: 'H. G. Wells, *A Modern Utopia*.' November. J. Redlich: 'Hungary and Austria.' J. H. Rose: 'The True Significance of Trafalgar.' E. Cannan: 'The Principle of Municipal Training.' W. Diack: 'The Scottish Farm Labourer.' H. Paul: 'E. V. Lucas, *Life of Charles Lamb*.' G. M. Trevelyan: 'W. Hunt, *Political History of England*, Vol. X. (1760-1801).' December. H. G. Wells: 'This Misery of Boots.' A plea for Socialism! H. B. Marriott

Watson: 'The Unknown God.' F. Bell: 'What People Read.' F. Y. Eccles: 'José-Maria de Heredia.'

The Edinburgh Review (No. 414. October 1905. Longmans). 'Lord Granville.' 'Early Christian and Byzantine Art and Archaeology.' Reviews Richter and Taylor: 'Golden Age of Classic Christian Art.' 'The Novels of Miss Yonge.' 'The Study of Greek.' 'Mr. Trevelyan's Stuarts.' 'Garden City and Garden Suburb.'

The Quarterly Review (No. 405. October 1905. John Murray). G. Smith: 'Recent Literary Criticism in France.' 'The Study of Popular Governments, II.' W. H. Hutton: 'Erasmus and the Reformation.' A. Lang: 'The Aborigines of Australia.' 'The Rights and Limits of Theology.' J. Trevelyan: 'Goethe's Mother.' 'The Poetry and Criticism of Mr. Swinburne.' W. Burghclere: 'A Courtier of James II.' J. K. Laughton: 'The Centenary of Trafalgar.'

The Classical Review (Vol. XIX. Nos. 7-9. October-December 1905. D. Nutt). J. P. Postgate: 'Yews and Suicide'; 'Vendeyes, *Traité d'Accentuation Grecque*.' W. M. Ramsay: 'Lycaonian and Phrygian Notes, I.' (continued November). Important. A. B. Cook and W. Richardson: 'Triremes' Illustrated. November. T. W. Allen: 'Theognis.' December. J. P. Postgate: 'Uncanny Thirteen.' H. Richards: 'Stewart, *Myths of Plato*.' A. C. Pearson: 'J. v. Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*.' R. M. Burrows: 'Whitley, *Companion to Greek Studies*.' F. E. Thompson: 'P. Gardner, *Grammar of Greek Art*.' G. Macdonald: 'G. F. Hill, *Greek Coins of Cyprus*.'

Hermathena (No. XXXI. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co.). E. S. Robertson: 'The Early History of India.' J. P. Mahaffy: 'On the History of Sizarship in Trinity College.' H. J. Lawlor: 'Two Collections of Visitation Reports in the Library of Trinity College.' Interesting and important. MSS. 566 (E. 3. 14) and 1066, dates 1588-1615. J. G. Smyly: 'On the Relation of the Macedonian to the Egyptian Calendar.' F. R. M. Hitchcock: 'Notes on the Ignatian Epistles.' J. B. Bury: 'Navarino.' F. Purser: 'On the Method and Teaching of Elementary Geometry.' R. A. P. Rogers: 'The Deduction of Space from Time.' [T. K. Abbott]: 'Letters of Henry Bradshaw on Irish Typography.' A. R. Eagar: 'Some Thoughts as to the Absolute.' Reviews: 'F. X. Burges, *Minucius Felix und Seneca*.' 'Wordsworth and White, *Nouum Testamentum*, II. 1, *Actus Apostolorum*.'

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The more important will be reviewed in Short Notices or Articles as space permits.

BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

AYRES, S. G.—*Complete Index to the Expositor's Bible*. With Preface to the *Expositor's Bible* by W. R. NICOLL and Introductions by W. H. BENNETT and W. F. ADENEY. Pp. 312. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 7s. 6d.

FOUARD, C.—*Saint John and the Close of the Apostolic Age*. Authorised Translation. Pp. xxxiv + 250. (Longmans.) 7s. 6d.

JOWETT, J. H.—*The Epistles of St. Peter*. 'Devotional and Practical Commentary.' Pp. viii + 346. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s.

KNOWLING, R. J.—*The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ viewed in*

some of its Aspects. 'Boyle Lectures,' 1903-5. Pp. viii + 534. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 10s. 6d. net.

LANGTRY, J.—*A Struggle for Life: Higher Criticism Criticised*. Pp. 328. (Toronto: W. Briggs.)

McFADYEN, J. E.—*An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Pp. xii + 356. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

MEAGHER, J. L.—*The Tragedy of Calvary; or, The Minute Details of Christ's Life from Palm Sunday Morning till the Resurrection and Ascension, taken from Prophecy, History, Revelations and Ancient Writings*. Pp. 14 + 490. (New York: Christian Press Association.) 4s. 6d. net.

MOFFATT, J.—*Literary Illustrations of the Bible. Daniel. Ecclesiastes. St. Mark. St. Luke. Romans. Revelation*. Pp. viii + 90, viii + 102, viii + 104, viii + 166, viii + 132, viii + 156. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 1s. 6d. each net. Six pretty little books of considerable interest, and literary merit.

SCHIAPARELLI, G.—*Astronomy in the Old Testament*. Authorized English Translation with many Corrections and Additions by the Author. Pp. viii + 178. (Clarendon Press.) 3s. 6d. net.

SCOTT, C. A.—*The Book of the Revelation*. 'Devotional and Practical Commentary.' Pp. xii + 338. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s.

STEVENS, W. A., and BURTON, E. DE W.—*A Harmony of the Gospels for Historical Study: an Analytical Synopsis of the Four Gospels*. Fifth edition, revised. Pp. x + 284. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s. net.

WESTCOTT, RIGHT REV. B. F. (the late).—*A General View of the History of the English Bible*. Third edition revised by W. ALDIS WRIGHT. Pp. xx + 356. (Macmillan.) 12s. 6d.

WRIGHT, C. H. H.—*Daniel and his Prophecies*. Pp. xxii + 334. (Williams and Norgate.) 7s. 6d.

APOLOGETICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

DOLE, C. F.—*The Theology of Civilization*. Second Edition. Pp. xxiv + 256. (Allenson.) 3s. 6d. net.

FERRIES, G.—*The Growth of Christian Faith*. Pp. xvi + 368. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.) 7s. 6d. net.

HIRSCHFELD, H.—*Judah Hallewi's Kitab al Khazari*. Translated from the Arabic with an Introduction. Pp. vi + 314. (Routledge.) 5s. net.

JONES, H.—*The Philosophy of Martineau in Relation to the Idealism of the Present Day*: being an Address delivered in Manchester College, Oxford, at the celebration of the Centenary of Dr. Martineau. Pp. 38. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

JORDAN, L. H.—*Comparative Religion, its Genesis and Growth*. With an Introduction by A. M. FAIRBAIRN. Pp. xx + 668. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.) 12s. net.

KOELLE, S. W.—*The Goal of the Universe; or, The Travail of the World's Saviour*. Cheap edition. Pp. x + 400. (Elliot Stock.) 3s. 6d.

LEA, T. S.—*Essays in Logos and Gnosis mainly in relation to the Neo-Buddhist Theosophy*. Pp. viii + 126. (Frowde.) 3s. 6d. net.

ORR, J.—*God's Image in Man and its Defacement in the Light of Modern Denials*. Pp. xvi + 326. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

SORTAIS, G.—*La Providence et le Miracle devant la Science moderne*. Pp. iv + 192. (Paris: G. Beauchesne et Cie.) 2 fr. 50.

SWETE, H. B. (Edited by).—*Essays on some Theological Questions of the Day*. By Members of the University of Cambridge. Pp. xiv + 600. (Macmillan.) 12s. net.

WAGGETT, P. N.—*The Scientific Temper in Religion and other Addresses*. Pp. xiv + 288 (Longmans.) 4s. 6d. net.

WOOD, I. F.—*The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature: a Study in the History of Religion*. Pp. xiv + 280. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

MORAL AND METAPHYSICAL PHILOSOPHY.

KING, H. C.—*Rational Living: some Practical Inferences from Modern Psychology*. Pp. xviii + 272. (New York: The Macmillan Co.) 5s. net.

LODGE, O.—*Life and Matter: a Criticism of Professor Haeckel's 'Riddle of the Universe.'* Pp. x + 200. (Williams and Norgate.) 2s. 6d. net.

MORGAN, C. LLOYD.—*The Interpretation of Nature*. Pp. 164. (Macmillan.) 2s. net.

CHURCH HISTORY.

ALLARD, P.—*Dix Leçons sur le Martyre: données à l'Institut catholique de Paris*. (Février-Avril 1905.) Préface de Mgr. PECHENARD. (Paris: V. Lecoffre.) 3fr. 50.

CHARTERIS, A. H.—*The Church of Christ, its Life and Work: An Attempt to trace the Work of the Church in some of its Departments from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. Pp. xii + 250 (Macmillan.) 6s.

DUDDEN, F. H.—*Gregory the Great: his Place in History and Thought*. Two Volumes. Pp. xviii + 476, vii + 474. (Longmans.) 30s. net.

FOTHERINGHAM, J. K.—*The Bodleian Manuscript of Jerome's Version of the Chronicle of Eusebius*. Reproduced in collotype, with an Introduction. Pp. 72 + 242 collotype pages. (Clarendon Press.) 2l. 10s. net.

GALTON, A.—*The Appeal of the Church of England: an Examination of our Principles and Positions in the Light of History*. With a Preface by Dean WACE. Pp. x + 158. (Dover Street Book Store.) 2s. net.

HANCOCK, T.—*The Puritans and the Tithes*. Pp. 60. (S.P.C.K.) 6d.

HULL, E.—*Early Christian Ireland*. 'Epochs of Irish History, II.' Pp. xxii + 284. (D. Nutt.) 2s. 6d. net.

JAMES, L. J., and EVANS, W. E.—*Tarian yr Eglwys: Llawlyfr i Eglwys-wyr*. Pp. xvi + 128. (Llanbedr-Pont-Stephan: Argraffwyd gan Gwmni y Wasg Eglwysig Gymreig, Cyfyngedig.)

LEGG, J. WICKHAM.—*Papal Faculties allowing Food before Communion*. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes. Pp. 102. 'Church Historical Society' Tracts, lxxxviii. (S.P.C.K.) 5s.

STONE, D.—*The Christian Church*. Pp. viii + 470. (Rivington.) 7s. 6d. net.

— *The Conditions of Church Life in the First Six Centuries*. With a Speech and a Sermon by W. E. COLLINS, BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR. 'Church Historical Society' Tracts, xcii. Pp. 56. (S.P.C.K.)

SYSTEMATIC AND DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BRADFORD, A. H.—*The Inward Light*. Pp. 292. (J. Clarke & Co.) 3s. 6d. net. Deals with questions connected with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

DAVIES, E. O.—*Theological Encyclopædia: an Introduction to the Study of Theology*. With an Introduction by A. M. FAIRBAIRN. Pp. xvi + 156. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s.

WHITHAM, A. R.—*The Faith of the Church: the Witness of the Three Creeds.* Pp. xii + 148. (Rivington.) 2s. 6d. net.

WOTHERSPOON, H. J.—*Creed and Confession: their Relations to one another and to the Church.* 'Macleod Memorial Lecture, 1905.' Pp. 32. (Blackwood.) 1s. net.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

Plain Sermons for the Christian Year. By Various Contributors. 'Sermons for the People,' Second Series. Vol. I. Advent to Christmastide. Vol. II. Epiphany to Quinquagesima. Pp. iv + 186, iv + 214. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. each. An interesting and suggestive series by well-known preachers.

BEECHING, H. C.—*The Grace of Episcopacy.* (Nisbet.) 3s. 6d.

BRETT, G.—*The Life of the Faithful Departed.* A Course of Sermons preached in substance at St. Stephen's Church, South Kensington, in November 1904. Pp. viii + 50. (Mowbray.) 6d. net.

BROWNE, RIGHT REV. G. F. (BISHOP OF BRISTOL).—*What is Man?* An Address to Men and Women delivered in Great St. Mary's Church before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, 15th November 1903. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1d. Reprinted from the *Cambridge Review*.

COOPER-MARSDIN, A.—*Church or Sect.* Pp. 48. (Elliot Stock.) 1s. 6d. net.

COYLE, R. F.—*The Church and the Times.* Pp. xii + 308. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

CREIGHTON, BISHOP (the late).—*The Claims of the Common Life.* Sermons preached in Merton College Chapel, 1871-4. Pp. xii + 144. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d.

DARLOW, T. H.—*The Upward Calling.* One Hundred Short Addresses to Young Men and Women. Pp. xii + 348. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

LOCK, W.—*The Bible and Christian Life.* Pp. xxiv + 324 (Methuen.) 6s.

MACFARLAND, C. S.—*The Spirit Christlike.* Pp. 176. (Boston: The Pilgrim Press. London: J. Clarke & Co.) 2s. 6d. net. Devotional Addresses by an American Congregationalist Minister.

MORRISON, G. H.—*The Untlighted Lustre.* Addresses from a Glasgow Pulpit. Pp. xii + 278. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s.

ROBERTSON, ALEXANDER.—*Venetian Sermons drawn from the History, Art, and Customs of Venice.* Pp. xvi + 308. (G. Allen.) 10s. 6d. net. With 73 illustrations.

SANDERSON, T.—*Unfulfilled Designs, and other Sermons.* Pp. xii + 212. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 3s. 6d.

STALEY, V.—*The Holy Communion.* Addresses and Instructions doctrinal, practical, and ceremonial concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. Pp. x + 228. (Mowbray.) 2s. net.

TWELLS, H. (the late).—*Sermons on Hymns, and other Addresses.* Pp. viii + 258. (Wells Gardner.) 3s. 6d. New edition.

WILLIAMS, F. M.—*Advent Addresses.* Pp. viii + 210. (Mowbray.) 2s. 6d. net. 'Preparation for Death,' 'Life after Death,' 'The Judgment,' 'The Last Four Articles of the Creed,' 'The Marks of the Church.'

DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

BEGGIE, H.—*The Happy Christ: a Monograph.* Pp. 118. (Skeffingtons.) 2s.

CONGREVE, G. (S.S.J.E.).—*The Spiritual Order.* With other Papers and

Addresses written for the most part in South Africa. Pp. xii + 354. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

DEARMER, P.—*The Sanctuary: a Book for Communicants*. Designed as a Companion to the Book of Common Prayer, and containing Short Daily Prayers with Private Devotions, Preparation, Thanksgiving, and Instruction for the Holy Communion. With the Additional Collects, Epistles, and Gospels from 'The English Liturgy.' Pp. viii + 210. (Rivingtons.) 1s. 4d. net.

HART, C.—*A Book for Children about our Lord Jesus Christ*. With thirty Colour Plates by A. A. HILTON. Pp. 74. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net.

JONES, J. D.—*Christ's Pathway to the Cross*. Pp. 128. (J. Clarke and Co.) 1s. 6d. net.

KNIGHT, G. H.—*In the Secret of His Presence*. Pp. xii + 230. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 3s. 6d.

NICOLL, W. R.—*The Garden of Nuts: Mystical Expositions, with an Essay on Christian Mysticism*. Pp. x + 232. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 3s. 6d.

M., G.—*With the Beloved: a Book of Private Devotion in Verse*. Pp. xii + 192. (Mowbray.) 1s. 6d. net.

MADDISON, H. M.—*A Sunday Service for the Sick (Taken chiefly from the Prayer Book)*. Pp. 16. (London: Hills and Co.) 6d. Should be found helpful by many.

ST. PETER OF ALCÁNTARA.—*A Golden Book of Mental Prayer*. A new Translation [by G. F. BULLOCK] edited by G. S. HOLLINGS, S.S.J.E. Pp. xxviii + 180. (Mowbray.) 1s. 6d. net.

RANDOLPH, B. W. (Edited by).—*The Private Devotions of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Martyr*. Pp. xii + 190. (Mowbray.) 1s. net.

REID, W. A.—*Christian Prayer*. With an Introduction by A. H. CHARTERIS. Pp. xii + 304. (Edinburgh: Blackwood.) 5s. net.

RIDGEWAY, C. J.—*Preparation Service for Holy Communion*. To be used in Church after Evensong on Sundays, or at such Time as shall be deemed most convenient. Pp. 16. (Skeffingtons.) 1d. Sanctioned for use in the Diocese of London.

SCOTT, M.—*The Harmony of the Proper Psalms for the Fastes and Festivals of the Church Year: a Devotional Exposition*. Pp. viii + 112. (Bemrose.) 2s. 6d. Gives a detailed analysis of these Psalms with a discussion of their appropriateness.

TWINING, A. G.—*The Childhood of our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ: for the Children of His Church*. With a Preface by the BISHOP OF LONDON. Pp. xvi + 110. (Mowbray.) 1s. 6d. net.

W[OODWARD], G. R.—*Songs of Syon: a Collection of Hymns and Sacred Poems, mostly translated from ancient Greek, Latin, and German Sources*. With a Preface by A. RILEY. Pp. viii + 210.

WOODWARD, G. R.—*Songs of Syon, consisting mostly of Authentick forms of the Early English and French Psalm Tunes and of the best German Chorales*. Second edition. Pp. viii + 112. Additional Hymns. Pp. iii + 112-128. (London: Schott and Co.)

Conversations with Christ: a Biographical Study. By the Author of *The Faith of a Christian*. Pp. viii + 282. (Macmillan.) 3s. 6d. net.

The Pilot: a Book of Daily Guidance from Master Minds. Pp. xvi + 368. (J. Clarke and Co.) 2s. 6d. net. A pretty little book on thin paper. The term 'Master Minds' has been, perhaps, rather too widely interpreted.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY AND ETHICS.

BICKERSTETH, M. C.—*Letters to a Godson.* I. How to read the Old Testament in the light of the New. II. An Attempt to give a reasonable Account of Christian Doctrine with Suggestions for further Study. Two volumes. Pp. xvi + 368, x + 320. (Mowbray.) See C.Q.R. Oct 1904.

BRUCE, W. S.—*Social Aspects of Christian Morality.* 'Croall Lectures,' 1903-4. Pp. viii + 408. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 10s. 6d. net.

[CHAPMAN, F.]—*Divine Considerations*, by JOHN VALDESSO. The English Translation of NICHOLAS FERRAR with GEORGE HERBERT'S prefatory Epistle. Pp. lx + 458. (John Lane.) 2s. net. A charming little book.

CHAPMAN, H. LA G. D.—*Jesus Christ the Friend of Sinners: Words of Counsel and Comfort.* With Note commendatory by the late Dean HOLE. Pp. vi + 256. (London: W. Stock.)

—, *Masteries for Men.* Pp. 160. (London: W. Stock.)

CREIGHTON, L.—*Counsel for the Young.* Extracts from the Letters of MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., sometime Bishop of London. Pp. xviii + 150. (Longmans.) 2s. 6d. net. Interesting and stimulating.

DEANE, A. C.—*At the Master's Side: Studies in Discipleship.* Pp. viii + 100. (Wells Gardner.) First appeared in the *Treasury*.

DOLE, C. F.—*The Coming People: a Study of Life in its Religious and Social Aspects.* Pp. x + 210. (Allenson.) 3s. 6d.

HART, VERY REV. H. M.—*The Ten Commandments in the Twentieth Century.* Pp. 62. (Skeffington.) 1s. net.

INSKIP, J. T.—*The Pastoral Idea.* Lectures on Pastoral Theology delivered at King's College, London, during the Lent Term, 1905. With a Preface by the BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS. Pp. xiv + 332. (Macmillan.) 6s.

'PILGRIM, A.'—*Greatheart: some Talks with him.* Pp. vi + 192. (Macmillan.) 3s. net.

LANG, RIGHT REV. C. G. (BISHOP OF STEPNEY).—*The Opportunity of the Church of England.* Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Cambridge in 1904. Pp. xiv + 192 (Longmans.) 2s. 6d. net.

LYTTTELTON, E.—*Studies in the Sermon on the Mount.* Pp. x + 392. (Longmans.) 12s. net.

L. S.—*Religious Genius.* Pp. viii + 264. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6s.

MATURIN, B. W.—*Self-Knowledge and Self-Discipline.* Pp. vi + 302. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

NELSON (EARL).—*Home Reunion: Reflections on the present Position of Nonconformists and an Appeal for a better mutual Understanding.* Pp. viii + 330. (Murray.) 6s. net.

ROGERS, C. F.—*Principles of Parish Work: an Essay in Pastoral Theology.* Pp. xvi + 292. (Longmans.) 5s. net.

STRACHAN, J.—*Hebrew Ideals from the Story of the Patriarchs.* Part Second (Gen. 25-30). 'Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.' Pp. 170. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.) 2s.

WAGNER, C.—*The Upright Life.* Pp. xii + 228. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 3s. 6d.

MISSIONS.

ARNOLD, A.—*Church Work in Japan*. With a Preface by BISHOP AWDRY. Pp. viii + 208. (S.P.G.) 2s. 6d.

BARNES, I. H.—*In Salisbury Square*. With Preface by Sir J. H. KEN-
NAWAY, Bart. Pp. viii + 236. (C.M.S.) 2s. 6d.

CALLAWAY, G.—*Sketches of Kafir Life (with Illustrations)*. With Preface
by BISHOP A. G. S. GIBSON of Capetown. Pp. xvi + 154. (Mowbray.)
2s. 6d. net.

GOLLOCK, M. C.—*River, Sand, and Sun : being Sketches of the C.M.S.
Egypt Mission*. Pp. viii + 184. (C.M.S.) 3s. 6d.

*Outlines of Missionary Lessons, including a Series of Lessons introductory
to the Study of Missions and Sketches of Mission Work in the Colonies and
among the Heathen*. Pp. iv + 208. (S.P.G.) 1s.

LITURGICA.

RILEY, A.—*A Guide to High Mass Abroad*. Pp. 108. (Mowbray.) 1s.
For use in Roman Catholic countries, with an Introduction and Notes.

SPROTT, G. W.—*Euchologion, a Book of Common Order : being Forms
of Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Ordinances of
the Church*. Pp. xxiv + 434. (Blackwood.) 4s. 6d. net.

MODERN HISTORY.

ADAMS, G. B.—*The History of England from the Norman Conquest to
the Death of John (1066-1216)*. 'The Political History of England, Vol. II.'
Pp. x + 474. With 2 maps. (Longmans.) 7s. 6d. net.

DAVIS, H. W. C.—*England under the Normans and Angevins, 1066-1272*.
'Oman's History of England,' Vol. II. Pp. xxii + 578. (Methuen.)
10s. 6d. net. With 7 Appendices, 2 Tables, and 11 Maps.

HUNT, W.—*The History of England from the Accession of George III. to
the Close of Pitt's First Administration (1760-1801)*. 'The Political
History of England,' Vol. X. Pp. xviii + 496. With 3 Maps. (Long-
mans.) 7s. 6d. net.

INNES, A. D.—*England under the Tudors*. 'Oman's History of England,'
Vol. IV. Pp. xx + 482. (Methuen.) 10s. 6d. net. With 4 Appendices
and 6 Maps.

MACCUNN, F. A.—*Mary Stuart*. Pp. xii + 318. (Methuen.) 10s. 6d.
net.

PAUL, H.—*A History of Modern England*. Vol. IV. Pp. vi + 412.
(Macmillan.) 8s. 6d. net.

TOUT, T. F.—*The History of England from the Accession of Henry III.
to the Death of Edward III. (1216-1377)*. 'The Political History of
England,' Vol. III. Pp. xxiv + 496. (Longmans.) 7s. 6d. net. With
an Appendix on Authorities and 3 Maps.

BIOGRAPHY.

BRADLEY, A. G.—*Captain John Smith*. 'English Men of Action'
Series. Pp. viii + 226. (Macmillan.) 2s. 6d.

DONALDSON, A. B. (the late).—*Richard William Church*. Pp. viii + 140.
(Rivingtons.) 2s. 6d. net.

VOL. LXI.—NO. CXXII.

H H

DONALDSON, A. B. (the late).—*Henry Parry Liddon*. Pp. viii + 162. (Rivingtons.) 2s. 6d. net.

Excellent reprints of two sections of *Five Great Oxford Leaders*, third edition.

KELWAY, A. C.—*George Rundle Prynne : a Chapter in the early History of the Catholic Revival*. Pp. xiv + 248. (Longmans.) 6s. 6d. net.

MARGOLIOUTH, D. S.—*Mohammed and the Rise of Islam*. 'Heroes of the Nations' Series. Pp. xxviii + 482. (New York and London : G. P. Putnam's Sons.) 5s.

MOULE, RIGHT REV. H. (BISHOP OF DURHAM).—*The School of Suffering : a Brief Memorial of Mary E. E. Moule, with a Portrait*. Pp. 126. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d.

O'BRIEN, W.—*Recollections*. Pp. x + 518. (Macmillan.) 14s. net.

ROWAN, E.—*Wilson Carlile and the Church Army*. Pp. xvi + 488. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 3s. 6d.

RUSSELL, G. W. E.—*Dr. Liddon*. 'Leaders of the Church, 1800-1900,' Vol. III. Pp. xii + 206. (Mowbray.) 3s. 6d. net.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

AINGER, A. (the late).—*Lectures and Essays*. Edited by H. C. BEECHING. Two Volumes. Pp. xvi + 408, vi + 334. (Macmillan.) 15s. net.

BALFOUR, R.—*The Seraphic Keepsake : a Talisman against Temptation, written for Brother Leo by St. Francis of Assisi : also his Words of Counsel and Praise of God Most High*. Printed in Facsimile from the Saint's Handwriting, and set forth in English. Pp. viii + 124. (Burns and Oates.) 3s. 6d. net.

BIRRELL, A.—*Andrew Marvell*. 'English Men of Letters' Series. Pp. viii + 242. (Macmillan.) 2s. net. See Short Notice, p. 450.

BUNYAN, JOHN.—*Life and Death of Mr. Badman and The Holy War*. Text edited by J. BROWN. Pp. viii + 432. (Cambridge University Press.) 4s. 6d. net. 'Cambridge English Classics.' An interesting reprint.

[CHAPMAN, F.]—*The Poems of John Henry Newman, afterwards Cardinal*. Pp. xx + 358. (John Lane.) 2s. net. Will be widely welcomed.

COURTHOPE, W. J.—*A History of English Poetry*. V. *The Constitutional Compromise of the Eighteenth Century. Effects of the Classical Renaissance ; its Zenith and Decline ; the Early Romantic Renaissance*. Pp. xxviii + 464. (Macmillan.) 10s. net.

COX, J. C.—*The Royal Forests of England*. 'The Antiquary's Books.' Pp. xvi + 372. (Methuen.) 7s. 6d. net. With 53 Illustrations.

CRAWFORD, F. MARION.—*Gleanings from Venetian History*. With 225 Illustrations by JOSEPH PENNELL. Two Volumes. Pp. xii + 518, x + 442. (Macmillan.) 21s. net.

EGERTON, HAKLUYT.—*Patriotism : an Essay towards a Constructive Theory of Politics*. Pp. viii + 344. (George Allen.) 5s. net.

EVANS, H. A.—*Highways and Byways in Oxford and the Cotswolds*. 'Highways and Byways Series.' Pp. xvi + 408. (Macmillan.) 6s.

FOGAZZARO, A.—*Il Santo*. Romanzo. Pp. vi + 478. (Milan : Baldini, Castoldi & Co.) 5 lire.

FRAZER, J. G.—*Lectures in the Early History of the Kingship*. Pp. xii + 310. (Macmillan.) 8s. 6d. net.

GOSSE, E.—*Sir Thomas Browne*. 'English Men of Letters' Series. Pp. viii + 216. (Macmillan.) 2s. net.

HOLLAND, H. S.—*Personal Studies*. Pp. viii + 288. (Wells Gardner.) 6s.

HUNT, W. HOLMAN.—*Pre-Raphaelitism and the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood*. With 40 Photogravure Plates and other Illustrations. Pp. xxviii + 512, xiv + 494. (Macmillan.) 42s. net.

JENNINGS, J. W., and ADDISON, C.—*With the Abyssinians in Somaliland*. With a Preface by A. N. ROCHFORD. Pp. xii + 266. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 10s. 6d. net. With 65 Illustrations from photographs taken by Major Jennings, and a Map.

SHORTER, C. K.—*Charlotte Bronte and her Sisters*. 'Literary Lives' Series. Pp. viii + 252. (Hodder & Stoughton.) 3s. 6d.

TENNYSON, LORD (the late).—*In Memoriam*: annotated by the Author. Pp. iv + 266. (Macmillan.) 5s. net. An interesting little book.

EDUCATION.

ADAMSON, J. W.—*Pioneers of Modern Education, 1600-1700*. Pp. xxii + 286. (Cambridge University Press.) 4s. 6d. net.

'KAPPA'.—*Let Youth but Know: a Plea for Reason in Education*. Pp. 256. (Methuen.) 3s. 6d. net. Reprinted from the *Westminster Gazette*.

WORDSWORTH, RIGHT REV. J. (BISHOP OF SALISBURY).—*Education Rates and Religious Instruction*. An attempt to answer the question 'What is our duty as to the payment of rates, including payment for religious instruction?' with suggestions for a solution of the present difficulty. A Paper read at the Annual Educational Conference at Salisbury on Thursday, November 9, 1905. Pp. 16. (Longmans.) 6d.

GIFT BOOKS, ETC.

CLARKE, MRS. H.—*The Coplestone Cousins*. Pp. 222. (S.P.C.K.) A West Country tale of the Eighteenth Century. 2s.

COWPER, E. E.—*The Haunted Mill on Birley River: a Story of a South Coast Creek*. Pp. 254. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. 6d.

EDWARDS, L.—*A Queer Child: a Tale of Village School Life*. Pp. 218. (S.P.C.K.) 2s.

FARMILOE, E.—*Elizabeth over the Way*. Pp. 62. (S.P.C.K.) 1s.

FARROW, G. E.—*The Mysterious 'Mr. Punch.'* A School Story. Pp. 254. (S.P.C.K.) Half school story, half fairy tale. 2s. 6d.

FURNISS, H.—*Friends without Faces—a Fairy's Rebuke to Vanity: a Tale for Children*. Illustrated by the Author. Pp. 62. (S.P.C.K.) 3s. 6d.

HARRISON, F.—*Rupert Dudley: a Story of Old Brighton*. Pp. 380. (S.P.C.K.) 3s. 6d.

HUNT, E.—*The Cornish Men, Tom and Bear, Violet's Lent*. 'Stories for Children of the Church.' Pp. 64 each. (Wells Gardner.) 6d. each. Pretty little books. Illustrations rather stiff.

LOCH, E.—*A Beaver of Despatches: a Story of the Siege of Lynn, 1643*. Pp. 158. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d.

MALLANDAINE, C. E.—*A Broken Cup*. Pp. 128. (S.P.C.K.)

NEALE, J. M. (the late).—*Lent Legends*. Stories for children from Church History. Pp. 160. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d.

NEALE, J. M. (the late).—*Stories from the Heathen Mythology and Greek History for the Use of Christian Children.* Pp. 158. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d.

— *The Followers of the Lord: Stories for Children from Church History.* Pp. 126. (S.P.C.K.) 1s.

— *Duchénier; or, the Revolt of La Vendée.* Pp. 376. (S.P.C.K.) 3s. 6d.

Reprints of Dr. Neale's tales are always welcome, for he had a vivid historical imagination, and we know no better stories of their kind.

RADFORD, B.—*Kitty's Summer Holidays: a Story for Children.* Pp. 126. (S.P.C.K.)

ROBINSON, C.—*The Ten Little Babies.* Pp. 52. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d. A quaint book for small children.

SETH-SMITH, E. K.—*Friedhelm: a Story of the Fourth Crusade.* Pp. 160. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d.

SETON, E. T.—*Woodmyth and Fable.* Pp. 184. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5s. net. A delightful book.

SHARP, E.—*Micky.* Pp. x+240. (Macmillan.) 4s. 6d. A children's book, delightfully illustrated by H. M. Brock.

THACKERAY, W. M.—*The History of Henry Esmond, Colonel in the Service of Her Majesty Queen Anne, written by Himself.* With an Introduction by A. DOBSON, and Illustrations by H. THOMSON. Pp. xlviii+402. (Macmillan.) 6s. A beautiful addition to the 'Cranford' Series.

WOOD, F.—*My Friend Jack: an Idyll.* Pp. 126. (S.P.C.K.)

MISCELLANEOUS.

CODRINGTON, T.—*Roman Roads in Britain.* With large Chart of the Roman Roads and small Maps in the Text. Second Edition, revised. Pp. 404. (S.P.C.K.) 5s.

Diocese of Pretoria. Report 1904-1905. Published by Order of the Bishop of the Diocese. Pp. 134. (Johannesburg.)

DUNKLEY, C.—*Official Report of the Church Congress held at Weymouth,* Oct. 1905. Pp. xxiv+590. (Bemrose.) 10s. 6d. net. Most useful.

SENNETT, A. R.—*Garden Cities in Theory and Practice; being an Amplification of a Paper on the Potentialities of Applied Science in a Garden City, read before Section F. of the British Association.* Two volumes. Pp. xiv+558, xii+559-1404. (Bemrose.) 21s. net.

STACPOOLE, F.—*A Healthy Home and How to Keep it.* In two parts. Pp. viii+84, vi+88. (Wells Gardner.) 4d. each. Useful information in a small compass.

Sunday School Class Register with Prayers. Pp. viii+20. (London: Bemrose.) 4d.

The Dawn of Day, Volume for 1905. Pp. 286. (S.P.C.K.) 1s.

The Jewish Literary Annual, 1905. Pp. 140. (Union of Jewish Literary Societies.) 1s. net. A collection of Papers and Reports.

WHYMPER, A. (the late), and MOORE, F.—*The Evangelist Monthly.* A Church magazine for Parochial and General Circulation. Volume for 1905. Pp. 284. (Bemrose.) 2s.

We have also received from Messrs. Bemrose, Alexander Moring, Ltd. (The De La More Press), Mowbray, Sherlock, and the S.P.C.K., a number of Almanacs, pocket Diaries and Calendars of various prices and sizes which seem admirably adapted for the purposes for which they are intended, whether useful, or ornamental, or both.

INDEX TO VOL. LXI.

ABR

A BRAHAM, Rev. Dr., *Church and State in England*, 221
Ainger, (late) Rev. Canon, *The Gospel and Human Life*, 446

B ENSON, (late) Archbishop, *God's Board: a Series of Communion Addresses*, 218

Benson, Mr. A. C., *Rossetti*, ('English Men of Letters' Series), 454

Bernard, Rev. Canon T. D., *The Word and Sacraments*, &c., 217

Birrell, Mr. A., *Andrew Marvell* ('English Men of Letters' New Series), 450

Books received, Notes of, 238, 459

Bradley, Very Rev. Dean, *Innocent's Day Addresses*, 449

Burton, Rev. E., *Collection of Sermons Preached in St. Edmund's College [Ware]*, 450

C ANTERBURY, Archbishop of, *The Christian Opportunity*, 218

Christian Society, The, IV. *The Development of the Church*, 241 *sqq.*; the change involved by the appointment of 'the seven' (deacons), 242; the 'universal' character of the new faith first clearly stated by St. Stephen, 243; result of the persecution which followed on his martyrdom, *ib.*; the barrier removed between Jew and Gentile, 244; meaning of the name 'Christians' first given at Antioch, *ib.*; nationality of the first 'deacons', 245; their relations to the later diaconate, 245 *sq.*; various names given to the office of 'the

CHR

seven', 246; their supposed relation to the 'elders' of a Jewish community, 247; growth of the idea of an order of deacons, 248; the form of their appointment, *ib.*; almsgiving and charity as a note of the Church, 249; rapid manifestation of the Church as a missionary society, *ib.*; development of two classes of Christian ministers: missionary and local ministers, 250; meaning of titles applied to missionaries: the Apostles, or the Twelve, 251; various use of the title, 252; Prophets: origin of the order, 253; early references to their existence, 254; functions of the Prophets, 255; the ministers called Evangelists: their duties, 256; the occasional use of the term 'Teacher': duties of his office, 257; he clearly held a definite position, *ib.*; why Teachers are not often mentioned, 258; the first Christian missionaries were preachers, and also leaders in all spiritual functions, 259; what they did towards creating the homogeneity of the Church, 260; breach between Church and Synagogue, 261; the Christians form new associations for themselves: origin of Christian 'presbyters', *ib.*; history of the usage of the name, 261; evidence for their existence in the Apostolic age as a normal and regular ministry, 262 *sq.*; original identity of bishops and presbyters, 264; criticism of the oppo-

CHU

site theory held by Dr. Hatch and Professor Harnack, 265 *sq.*; answer to another theory, that presbyters did not exist in the Church until the close of the first century, 266 *sq.*; the negative arguments read into the early Church the prejudices of modern theology, 268; corroborative evidence for early date of presbyterate, *ib.*; the argument from the remote antiquity of the rule of the 'elders,' 269; the use of 'Gerousia' by Jews in Greek countries, *ib.*; differences between Christian 'presbyter' and Jewish 'elder,' 270; origin of the name 'Bishop': criticism of Dr. Hatch's theory, 271; functions of presbyters, 272; position of the Church at Jerusalem and of the Apostles in the altered circumstances: place of authority occupied by the Apostles, 273; position of importance occupied by St. Peter and by St. John, 274; the personal position occupied by James, the Lord's brother, 275; difficulty of assigning his constitutional position, 276: the constitution of the Church at Jerusalem was something abnormal, 277; how long the Apostles remained at Jerusalem, 278

Church Music, 303 *sqq.*: the exceptional position which music holds in regard to religion, 304; music as an art, 305; the development of its canons, 306; growth of ecclesiastical music, 307; Plainsong, 308; freedom required by modern composers of Church music, 309; the influence of the parson, 309 *sq.*; and that of the congregation, 310; 'bad tunes have a bad effect': how far this is true, 311; influence of cathedral music, 312; parochial churches: the management of the choir, 314; position of the organist, 315; the congregation's varying attitude to music, 316; hymns and anthems, 317; the Canticles and Psalms, 318;

CRE

chanting: Anglican chants preferred, 319; Dr. Richardson's new method of treating the Psalms (the *Southwark Psalter*): some criticisms thereon, 320; church music should act as a commentary on the words, 322

Classic Christian Art: The Mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore (review of Dr. Richter's and Miss A. C. Taylor's *The Golden Age of Classic Christian Art*), 84 *sqq.*: description of the basilica, 84; story of the mosaics, 85; history of the 'Basilica Liberii,' or 'Sicinini,' 86; the work of Xystus III., 86 *sq.*; the scenes in the mosaics, 87; how Dr. Richter and his colleague reached the secret contained in them, 88; their methods of investigation, 89; details of the foundations of their conclusions, 90; light thrown upon the period separating the Apostolic from the Constantinian Church, 91; value of Dr. Richter's conclusions, *ib.*; careful reproductions of his details, 92; the picture of the Passage of the Red Sea and that of the Annunciation, 93; evidence of interpolations, 94; traces of the original backgrounds: landscape details, 94 *sq.*; examination of the trustworthiness of Dr. Richter's theories, 95; his architectural arguments: date of the roof tiles, 96; the architrave which connects the columns, 97; the use of mosaic as a form of wall and ceiling decoration, *ib.*; the style of the mosaics, 98; the 'classical' qualities he sees in them, 98 *sq.*; criticisms on details, 100; his demonstration of the high artistic quality of the parts of the mosaics which are original, 101; his excellent exposition of their subject-matter, 101 *sq.*; suggested solutions of difficulties about their date, 103 *sqq.*

Creighton and Stubbs, 134 *sqq.*: two heavy losses to the Church in one year, 134; notice of Mr. Hutton's biography of Bishop

CRE

Stubbs, and of Mrs. Creighton's of her husband, 135 *sq.*; early life of Bishop Stubbs: at school and at Oxford, 136; life as a country parson at Navestock, 137; his historical studies while there: origins of the *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*, 138; his work for the Master of the Rolls' commission and its results, 139; Professor of Modern History at Oxford, 141; his avowal of faith in God's overruling guidance of the world, *ib.*; unwearied and strenuous labour at Oxford, 142; Canon of St. Paul's, 143; member of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, *ib.*; appointed to bishopric of Chester: Creighton's congratulations and Stubbs' reply, 144; Stubbs' work as a bishop, 145; translation to Oxford: on the Lincoln Case, 146; value of his four Charges as Bishop of Oxford: religious instruction of children, 147; his opinion on claims asserted for Canon Law in England, 148.—The keynote to Bishop Creighton's life, 149; his early days: school and University, *ib.*; specimens of exceptional love-letters, 150; life as country parson at Embleton, 151; appointed Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History, 152; his manifold occupations, *ib.*; development of his inner life: aphorisms on Biblical Criticism, 153; *History of the Papacy*: at issue with Lord Acton, 154; his episcopal life: the important events of his four years as Bishop of London, 155; signal success of his treatment of ritualistic questions, 156; Presidential address to the London Church Congress in 1899, 157; Round Table Conference at Fulham (1900), 158; his death: appreciation of his character by Archbishop Temple, 159; comparison of the powers and characteristics of the two prelates, Creighton and Stubbs, 159 *sqq.*; some contrasts between them,

EVE

160; Stubbs' caustic humour 161; his unerring learning and critical acumen, *ib.*; the most salient features of Creighton's character, 162

Crete, Recent Excavations in, and their bearing on the Early History of the Ægean, 379 *sqq.*: Mr. A. Evans' excavations at Knossos, 379; marvellous finds, 380; the great Palace, 381; wondrous works in porcelain and in ivory, 382; Mr. Evans' method of conservation of the works, 384; other explorers' work, 385; remarkable examples of artistic work, 386; details, 387; date of the art of Knossos, 389; 'Minoan' versus 'Mycenæan': chronological details of the Minoan periods, 390 *sqq.*; various dates assigned, 393; hieroglyphic writing in its perfection, and growth of linear signs, 394; art work of 1500 B.C., 395; a change in the Ægean world illustrated, 397; Dr. Waldstein's objections to some of Mr. Evans' attributions of Minoan art, 399; a reply thereto, 400 *sq.*; the early art of the Ægean cannot be assigned to the Carians or the Phœnicians, *ib.*; physical characteristics of the persons represented on the works of art, 404; light thrown upon language by recent discoveries, 405; aids to comprehending religious beliefs and practices, 407; a violent break in the civilization of Crete, 409; intrusion of the northern plunderer, 410; introduction of the Greek language, 411; Professor Ridgeway's theories criticized, 412

DOBSON, Mr. A., *Samuel Richardson* ('English Men of Letters' Series), 453
Douglas, Sir G., *The Life of Major-General Wauchope*, 223

EVELYN, John, *The Life of Margaret Godolphin* ('The King's Classics' Series), 224

FIN

FINDLAY, Rev. Dr., *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians*, 209

For Christ in Fuh-Kien (Church Missionary Society Mission), 212

Fourth Gospel, The, III. *Its Relation to the Synoptic Tradition*, 106 *sqq.*: number of the Discourses in St. John, compared with St. Matthew, 106 *sq.*; alleged prolixity of their style tested, 107; striking characteristics, 108; charge that the doctrine in this Gospel is strongly tinged with Hellenism, 109; doctrine of the Logos, *ib.*; question of the source of the expression, *ib.*; its earlier and its developed meaning, 110; the charge of lateness in character of the doctrines expressed in this Gospel, 111; the language of the Discourses compared with that of the First Epistle of St. John, 111 *sqq.*; evidence confirming the traditional view of the authorship of the Gospel, 113 *sq.*; the view of Christ which it presents differs from that in the Synoptic Gospels, 114; statement of the points of variation: the period covered by our Lord's Ministry, 115 *sq.*; loose chronology of all four Gospels, 116; the Fourth Gospel's selection of events to be recorded: comparison with the Synoptists, 117; alleged incompatible accounts: (1) St. John the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel and in the Synoptists, 118; (2) that there is a different conception of miracles and their significance in them, 119; motive of the miracles assigned by the Fourth Gospel, 120; (3) different presentation of the character and claims of our Lord Himself, 121; the position of Christ in the Synoptics, 122; in St. Matthew and St. Luke, 123; in St. Mark, 124; general character of their indications of the claims of Christ, 124 *sq.*; these compared

HYM

with those of the Fourth Gospel, 126; other apparent divergences in the two traditions, 127; doctrinal implications of the Synoptic account, 128; summary of conclusions: the Fourth Gospel was written by St. John, the beloved Apostle of our Lord, and contains trustworthy history, 128 *sqq.*; criticism of Dr. Abbott's theory in *The Letter and the Spirit*, 131 *sq.*; the importance of the Johannine question to the Church, 133

GEIL, Mr. W. E., *A Yankee on the Yangtze*, 211

Grafton, Bishop (Fond du Lac), *Christian and Catholic*, 220

Gurney, (the late) Rev. A., *Amor Ordinatus*, 220

HARRISON, Mr. F., *Chatham* ('Twelve English Statesmen' Series), 226

Hymns and Hymn-Books, 54 *sqq.*: the relation of a hymn to poetry, 54; examples of not-perfect hymns by great poets, 54 *sq.*; great hymn-writers mostly not known as poets, 55; comparison of various collections, 56; causes of differences between hymn-writers and poets, 56 *sq.*; characters of various classes of hymns, 58; hymns on unsuitable subjects, 59; the deliberate versification of doctrine, 60; essential quality of the poetry of hymns, 61; the proper object, purport and form of a hymn, 62; criticism of some hymns which are claimed to have 'a great effect,' 63; the music to which hymns are set, *ib.*; the proper use of refrains, 64; the service which good art in hymns renders to religion, 64; relation of hymns to the tastes of the congregation, 65; remarks on some collections of hymns: the *Public School Hymn-Book*, 66; the *Hampshire Hymn-Book for Children*, *ib.*; the *Methodist Hymn-Book*, 67; excellences of its new edition, 68; criticisms of

INV

the new edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, 69; popular use of technical language in religion, 70; mediæval hymns: renderings from Latin originals, 71; poor translations and bald versification, 72; specimens of the compilers' 'improvements,' 73; their timidity about strong poetical expressions, 75; mutilations, alterations, omissions, 76; the 'pious fraud' of the imitative hymn, 77 *sq.*; little weight attached to the literary side of the hymns, 79; hymns for special occasions, 79 *sq.*; the large proportion of hymns addressed to our Blessed Lord, 80; suggestions for forming an anthology of hymns, 81; the true principle of discrimination in the use of religious poetry has not yet been reached, 82

INVALIDS, The Spiritual Care of, 33 *sqq.*: lack of provision for spiritual needs of invalids of the upper and middle classes, 34; systematic visiting of the sick desiderated, *ib.*; appeal on the subject by Bishop Gore (Birmingham), 35; his views about faith-healing, *ib.*; difficulties of the clergy: waiting to be asked, 36; calls to the sick should be speedily responded to, 38; the priest in the sick room, *ib.*; Dr. Savage's *Pastoral Visitation*, 39; right and wrong ways of visitation of the sick, 39 *sqq.*; how to treat the various characters manifested by invalids, 41; evil results of clerical neglect to visit, 42; mental and intellectual helps needed by physical sufferers, 43; help required against paralysis of spiritual life, *ib.*; causes of such paralysis which a judicious priest can check, 44; benefits of training the sick in self-help, 46; Dr. Schofield (*The Force of Mind, &c.*) on the correlation of philosophy, theology and medicine, 47; visitation of the sick impeded by parochialism in towns, 48; the question of non-

LIB

parochial visitation, 49 *n.*; a plea for equality of treatment for the sick and the whole: Regular Visitation and Regular Communion, 50; the question of fasting Communion, 51 *sqq.*

KNOWLING, Rev. Dr., *The Epistle of St. James*, 207

LEWIS, Rev. A., *The Life and Work of E. J. Peck among the Eskimos*, 213

Liberal Theology, I., 1 *sqq.*: object and aim of the present article, 1; the questions raised by Liberal Theology, 2; definitions of Liberalism and Conservatism in religion, 3; Liberalism as a form of Humanism: what this means in theology, 5; how Liberal Theology attempts to make the creed and the Christian faith more missionary, 6; that faith must always make itself an intelligible and a reasonable faith, 7; the claims put in by the *Zeit-Geist*, 8; that Christian thought must come to terms with the conception of the 'Uniformity of Nature,' 9; examination of the meaning, 9 *sqq.*; what is meant by 'the miraculous,' 12; consideration of the answer, 13; how we reach our belief in God, 14; the ultimate nature of Reality, 15; the conception of an intervening God does not detract from His greatness, *ib.*; the 'law of uniformity' is only probably, not demonstratively, true, 16; answer to the historical question, 'Have miracles, in fact, occurred?' 17; what is required to satisfy the spirit of man, 18; the relation of the Practical to the Speculative Reason, 20; the Hypo-static Union illuminates the character of God as well as the nature of man, 21; why the foundation of our Faith is miraculous, 22; the theology of the Church on the Person of Christ, 23; Neo-Kantian and Hegelian theories criticized, 24; the Chris-

MAC

tology of modern idealism, 25 *sqq.*; effects of speculative idealisms, 27; why to us the Creeds are historical, 28; the grounds of individual faith, 29; criticism of Ritschlianism, 30; and of Dr. Gardner's *Exploratio Evangelica*, 32.—II. Answer to the question Have miracles ever happened? 415; *a priori* credibility necessary to essential Christian miracles and to Christian *credenda*, 416; *a priori* the Christian miracles are credible, 417; illustrations of this point, 417 *sq.*; what is really meant by 'the canons of reasonable criticism,' 418; application of the canon that 'the irrational cannot be true,' 419; that 'the irrational is incredible,' 420; exegesis of this principle of *criticism*, 421; what really is a miracle, 422; what the evangelical marvels disclose, 424; how we attain the knowledge of the Son of Man, 425; what makes a man a 'Christian,' 426; the effect of the grace of God, 427; the essentials of Christian faith, 428: what is involved in Christian assents, 429; relation of our ethical end with the order of Reality, 430; the effects on us of Creative Love, 431; the Word of Life is 'the pillar and ground of truth,' 432; the Church is the authoritative keeper of the evangelical records, 433; the different meanings of the 'Continuity of History,' 434; each meaning estimated, 435 *sqq.*

MACNAGHTEN, Mr. Chester, *Common Thoughts on Serious Subjects*, 448

Moore, Rev. H., *Here and There with the S.P.G. in India*, 213

Morin, Dom G., *S. Hieronymi Tractatus in Psalmos XIV.*, 205

NEW TESTAMENT, *The, in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford Society of Historical Theology), 204

RES

Nyasaland, Missions in, I., 279 *sqq.*: fifty years ago Nyasa was unknown, 279; ready response to Livingstone's appeal (1857) for missionary effort in the district, 280; the early beginnings, *ib.*; description of the geography of Nyasaland, 281; the climate, *ib.*; dangers of malaria, 282; political situation: British, German, and Portuguese districts, 283; the various tribes belong to the Bantu Negro race, 284; their physical characteristics, 285; details of Bantu languages, *ib.*; various industries followed by the people, 287; social arrangements: domestic slavery, polygamy, 288; their religious ideas, 289; cannibalism in connexion with witchcraft, 290; offerings to departed spirits, 291; character of the people, *ib.*; methods and results of various missions: Moravian, 292 *sq.*; Roman Missions, 293; United Free Church and Dutch Reformed Church: a 'Combined Mission,' 294; Livingstonia Mission, 295; its methods, 296; Blantyre Mission, 297; its work and schools, 299; education of girls as well as boys, 301; influence of the white population, 302

PENNY, Rev. Frank, *The Church in Madras*, 209
Periodicals, 228, 455

QUESTIONS of Faith: a Series of Lectures on the Creed (by Various Writers), 214

RESURRECTION of Christ, The Evidence for the, 323: from the beginning Christians have believed that 'Jesus lives,' 324; the basis of that faith: the Apostles had seen the Risen Christ, *ib.*; the argument which St. Paul founded thereon, 325 *sq.*; his details of the various apparitions, 327; the series of witnesses here incidentally marshalled, 330; reply to the theory

RID

that these witnesses were misled by delusions of the imagination, 332; the argument that St. Paul records that Christ was only *seen*, not *touched* or *heard*, 335; that the visions of the Risen Christ were no more than ordinary apparitions of the dead, 336; the answer supplied by St. Paul's argument in 1 Cor. xv., 337; analysis of the argument, 338; the difference between the Resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of His followers, 340; other kindred arguments of St. Paul, 341; Christ rose again 'the third day': basis of this belief, 343; the sayings of Jesus about His approaching death and the triumph which was to follow, 345; St. Luke's narrative of the visions of the Risen Christ, 346; the Witness of the Fourth Gospel, 349; of St. Mark, 350; and St. Matthew, 352; summary estimate of the evidence, 353

Ridding, (the late) Bishop, *A Litany of Remembrance*, 219.

SANDAY, Rev. Dr., *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*,

18439

School Tales, 356 *sqq.*; the difficulties of writing a good school story, 357; how these have been overcome, 359; causes of the success of *Tom Brown's School-days*, *ib.*; the weaknesses of Dean Farrar's works about schoolboys, 361; *Eric* and *S. Winifred's*, 362; criticism of Mr. Kipling's *Stalky and Co.*, 363; the characters of the boys and of their masters, 365; causes of the success of Mr. Vachell's *The Hill*, 366; a brilliant picture of life at Harrow, 366 *sq.*; Mr. Portman's excellent school tale, *Hugh Rendal*, 368; bullying at schools, *ib.*; various types of bullies, 370; a certain amount of Spartan training is not bad for boys, 371; appeal on behalf

SUS

of little sensitive boys in their early schooldays, *ib.*; the savage 'manliness' and the coarseness of schoolboys, 373; their 'honour': the practice of using cribs and co-operative work, 373 *sq.*; on 'making boys work', 374; position and duties of masters, 375; the cult of games, 375 *sq.*; 'rotters' and 'prigs', 376; the treatment of religion in schools, 377.

Sinker, Captain, *By Reef and Shoal* (Melanesian Mission), 213

Suso, Heinrich, the Mystic, 164 *sqq.*: his family name was von Berg: he preferred to be called Suso, his mother's name, 164; he was born about 1300: we know little of his early childhood, *ib.*; characters of his father and his mother, 165; Dominican novice at Constance: early struggles as a beginner in the spiritual life, *ib.*; a bitter trial of loneliness: his first rapture, 166; examination of the character of his visions, 166 *sq.*; how the Sacred Scriptures fired his heart: his spiritual espousal of Wisdom, 168; his description of his bride, 168 *sq.*; a vision granted in preparation for a great sorrow, 169; answers to his questions about matters of Faith, 170; how he carried out the practice of devotional mysticism, 171; austerities which he practised, and his reasons therefor, 172; development and expansion of his mysticism through protracted suffering, 173; slanders and false accusations against him, 175; sympathetic friends, 175; letters to his spiritual children, 176; his rescue of his sister from sin, *ib.*; his *Dialogue of Truth*, 177; influence on him of his teacher, Eckhardt, *ib.*; summary of Suso's philosophy, 178; his treatise called *The Little Book of the Nine Rocks*, 180; the *Book of the Eternal Wisdom*, 181; general estimate of Suso's writings, *ib.*

THO

THOMAS, Rev. W. H. Griffith;
A Sacrament of our Redemption, 215; *The Catholic Faith*, *ib.*

WEISMANN and the Theory
 of Descent (review of Dr.
 A. Weismann's *The Evolution
 Theory*), 182 *sqq.*: this work is
 a monumental summary of the
 author's life-work, 183; the
 cellular starting-point of every
 living being, *ib.*; explanation of
 terms used, 184; what Weismann
 means by the statement that the
 germ-cells are potentially im-
 mortal, 184 *sq.*; what Darwin
 meant by 'Pangenesiis,' 185 *sq.*;
 Weismann's theory of the 'con-
 tinuity of the germ-plasm,' 186;
 the morphological elements of
 the cell which carry on its ances-
 tral qualities, 187; 'nuclear
 membranes,' 'nucleoli,' *ib.*; ac-
 tion of 'chromatin granules,'
 188; 'chromosomes,' 188 *sq.*;
 the phenomenon of 'amphimixis,'

WEL

189; consideration of Weis-
 mann's argument that in the
 chromatin substance we have
 discovered the true material of
 heredity, 190 *sq.*: Wolff's theory
 of epigenesis, 192; meaning of
 Weismann's term 'id,' *ib.*; and
 of his doctrine of 'determinants,'
 192 *sq.*; the relative position of
 'determinants' within the 'id,'
 194; his 'biophors,' 195; sum-
 mary of his conception of the
 germ-plasm, *ib.*; integral and
 differential division, 196; a com-
 plex and continuous germ-plasm,
 and the 'soma,' 196 *sq.*; causes
 of individual variation in animals
 or plants, 198; effects of a shuf-
 fling and recombination of 'ids,'
 199 *sq.*; Weismann's theory of
 'germinal selection,' 201; sum-
 mary of his presentment of the
 theory of evolution, 202 *sq.*; his
 assurance that that theory is not
 prejudicial to faith, 203

Welldon, Bishop, *The School of
 Faith*, 449

PRINTED BY

SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., NEW-STREET SQUARE
 LONDON

eis-
the
have
of
cory
g of
and
nts,
a of
id,
um-
the
and
om-
sm,
uses
nals
huf-
ds,
of
um-
the
his
not

of